

# Urban Core Specific Plan

# Draft Environmental Impact Report

May 2006



Draft  
Environmental Impact Report  
for the  
City of Chula Vista Urban Core Specific Plan  
EIR #06-01  
SCH #2005081121

Lead Agency

City of Chula Vista  
Community Development Department  
276 Fourth Avenue  
Chula Vista, CA 91910

May 30, 2006

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	Executive Summary.....	1-1
2.0	Introduction.....	2-1
3.0	Project Description.....	3-1
4.0	Environmental Setting.....	4-1
5.0	Environmental Impact Analysis.....	5-1
5.1	Land Use .....	5-1
5.2	Landform Alteration/Aesthetics .....	5-48
5.3	Cultural Resources.....	5-78
5.4	Geology and Soils .....	5-102
5.5	Paleontological Resources.....	5-114
5.6	Population and Housing .....	5-120
5.7	Hydrology and Water Quality .....	5-129
5.8	Traffic, Circulation, and Access.....	5-143
5.9	Noise .....	5-192
5.10	Air Quality .....	5-207
5.11	Public Services .....	5-240
5.12	Public Utilities.....	5-261
5.13	Hazards/Risk of Upset.....	5-283
6.0	Cumulative Impacts.....	6-1
7.0	Growth-Inducing Impacts .....	7-1
8.0	Significant Irreversible Environmental Changes.....	8-1
9.0	Effects Found Not to Be Significant.....	9-1
10.0	Alternatives .....	10-1
11.0	References .....	11-1
12.0	EIR Preparation.....	12-1

**FIGURES**

3-1:	Regional Location .....	3-2
3-2:	Urban Core.....	3-3
3-3:	UCSP Subdistricts Key Map .....	3-12
3-4:	Zoning Sheet for Village Subdistrict V-1, East Village .....	3-14
3-5:	Zoning Sheet for Village Subdistrict V-2, Village.....	3-15
3-6:	Zoning Sheet for Village Subdistrict V-3, West Village .....	3-16
3-7:	Zoning Sheet for Village Subdistrict V-4, Civic Center.....	3-17
3-8:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-1, St. Rose .....	3-19
3-9:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-2, Gateway.....	3-20
3-10:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-3, Roosevelt.....	3-21
3-11:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-4, Hospital.....	3-22
3-12:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-5, Soho .....	3-23
3-13:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-6, Chula Vista Center Residential.....	3-24
3-14:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-7, Chula Vista Center.....	3-25
3-15:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-8, Otis .....	3-26
3-16:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-9, Mid H Street .....	3-27
3-17:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-10, Chula Vista Center West ..	3-28
3-18:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-11 Chula Vista Center West Residential.....	3-29
3-19:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-12, H Street Trolley.....	3-30
3-20:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-13, Mid Broadway .....	3-31
3-21:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-14, Harborview.....	3-32
3-22:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-15, E Street Trolley.....	3-33
3-23:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-16, Broadway Hospitality .....	3-34
3-24:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-17, Harborview North.....	3-35
3-25:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-18, E Street Gateway.....	3-36
3-26:	Zoning Sheet for Urban Core Subdistrict UC-19, Feaster School.....	3-37
3-27:	Zoning Sheet for Corridor Subdistricts C-1, Third Avenue South .....	3-39
3-28:	Zoning Sheet for Corridor Subdistricts C-2, Broadway South.....	3-40
3-29:	Zoning Sheet for Corridor Subdistricts C-3, Broadway North .....	3-41
3-30:	Urban Core Development Permit Design Review Process .....	3-44
4-1:	Aerial Photograph of Project .....	4-2
5.1-1:	UCSP Subdistricts Area .....	5-3
5.1-2:	General Plan Update Land Uses for the UCSP .....	5-5
5.1-3:	Existing Zoning Map of the UCSP Area .....	5-9
5.1-4:	Redevelopment Plan Areas .....	5-15
5.2-1:	UCSP Entryways and Gateways.....	5-58
5.2-2:	Intersection of Third Avenue and Davidson Street Looking North .....	5-64
5.2-3:	H Street Looking East Towards 5 <sup>th</sup> Street.....	5-67
5.2-4:	F Street Looking East.....	5-68
5.2-5:	Intersection of Broadway and D Street Looking South .....	5-70
5.3-1:	Designated Historic Architectural Sites .....	5-87
5.3-2:	Eligible Historic Architectural Sites .....	5-92
5.3-3:	Historically Significant Architectural Sites .....	5-95
5.4-1:	Geologic Formations .....	5-103
5.4-2:	Soil Types .....	5-106
5.5-1:	Paleontological Sensitivity.....	5-115
5.8-1:	General Plan Update Urban Core Circulation Element.....	5-148
5.8-2:	Existing Roadways and Study Intersections .....	5-151

**FIGURES (cont.)**

5.8-3:	Existing Roadway Geometrics .....	5-159
5.8-4:	Regional Transit Routes.....	5-160
5.8-5:	Year 2030 Conditions ADT Volumes .....	5-164
5.8-6:	Regional Transit Routes.....	5-172
5.8-7:	West Side Shuttle Proposed Route.....	5-175
5.8-8:	Existing and Proposed Bikeways .....	5-177
5.8-9:	Year 2030 with Improvements Intersection Geometrics .....	5-182
5.8-10:	Year 2030 with Improvements Intersection Geometrics .....	5-183
5.8-11:	Project Features/Improvements at Study Intersection .....	5-184
5.8-12:	Study Intersection Remaining at LOS E.....	5-191
5.9-1:	Exterior Land Use-Noise Compatibility Guidelines .....	5-193
5.9-2:	Noise Measurement Locations.....	5-195
5.9-3:	Year 2030 Traffic Noise Contours.....	5-201
5.10-1:	Link and Receptor Network for a Single Intersection with Dedicated Left-Turn Lanes .....	5-224
5.10-2:	Wind Rose for Chula Vista .....	5-230
5.11-1:	Parks, Plazas, Paseos, and Public Spaces .....	5-258
5.13-1:	Sites of Potential Environmental Concern within the General Plan Boundary .....	5-285
5.13-2:	Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Sites of Potential Concern.....	5-286
5.13-3:	Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS) List Sites of Potential Concern .....	5-287
5.13-4:	U.S. EPA Emergency Response Notification System (ERNS) Sites of Potential Concern .....	5-288
5.13-5:	State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) Spills, Leaks, Investigation, and Cleanups (SLIC) (SPILLS) Lists Sites of Potential Concern .....	5-290
5.13-6:	U.S. EPA Emergency Resource Conservation and Reclamation Act (RCRA) (Corrective Action) CORRACTS List Sites of Potential Concern .....	5-291
5.13-7:	California Department of Toxic Substances Control (DTSC) List Sits of Potential Concern .....	5-292
5.13-8:	Multiple Agency, State of California Solid Waste Landfill (SWL) List Sites of Potential Environmental Concern .....	5-293

**TABLES**

1-1:	Summary of Environmental Analysis Results .....	1-9
1-2:	Comparison of Project Alternatives.....	1-80
2-1:	CEQA-Required EIR Contents.....	2-8
3-1:	UCSP Subdistricts and Corresponding General Plan District.....	3-7
3-2:	UCSP Projected Buildout .....	3-8
3-3:	Discretionary Actions Required for Project Adoption and Implementation.....	3-46
5.1-1:	UCSP Subdistricts and Corresponding General Plan District .....	5-6
5.1-2:	UCSP Subdistrict Existing Zoning.....	5-10
5.1-3:	Existing Zoning Distribution Within the UCSP Subdistricts Area .....	5-11
5.1-4:	General Plan Update Consistency Table .....	5-22
5.1-5:	Conformance of the UCSP with SANDAG's Programs .....	5-34
5.1-6:	NCTD Required Setbacks For Rear/Side Yards .....	5-39

**TABLES (cont.)**

5.4-1:	Deterministic Site Parameters for Selected Active Faults .....	5-107
5.4-2:	Historical Earthquakes .....	5-107
5.5-1:	Paleontological Grading Thresholds .....	5-117
5.8-1:	Existing Conditions Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service Summary .....	5-153
5.8-2:	Existing Conditions Roadway Segment Level of Service Summary .....	5-157
5.8-3:	Trip Generation Summary .....	5-162
5.8-4:	Year 2030 Conditions Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service Summary ..	5-165
5.8-5:	Year 2030 Roadway Segment Level of Service Summary .....	5-169
5.8-6:	Year 2030 With Mitigation Conditions Peak Hour Intersection Level of Service Summary .....	5-185
5.8-7:	Year 2030 With Mitigation Conditions Roadway Segment Level of Service Summary .....	5-187
5.9-1:	Exterior Noise Limits .....	5-194
5.9-2:	Existing Ambient Noise Measurement Results .....	5-196
5.9-3:	Existing Traffic Volumes and Noise Levels .....	5-198
5.9-4:	2030 Traffic Volumes and Noise Levels .....	5-200
5.9-5:	Distance from Centerline Between Trolley Tracks to Unobstructed Noise Contours .....	5-202
5.10-1:	Ambient Air Quality Summary – San Diego Air Basin .....	5-209
5.10-2:	Criteria Pollutants - Sources and Health Effects .....	5-210
5.10-3:	Summary of Air Quality Measurements Recorded at the Chula Vista Monitoring Station .....	5-211
5.10-4:	SCAQMD Thresholds .....	5-216
5.10-5:	Yearly Construction Emissions .....	5-220
5.10-6:	Average Quarterly Emissions .....	5-220
5.10-7:	Average Daily Emissions to the San Diego Air Basin Resulting from Buildout of the UCSP .....	5-222
5.10-8:	Modeled Winter Co Concentrations due to Traffic .....	5-225
5.10-9:	Total Winter Co Concentrations at Modeled Receivers .....	5-226
5.10-10:	Modeled Summer Co Concentrations due to Traffic .....	5-228
5.10-11:	Total Summer Co Concentrations at Modeled Receivers .....	5-229
5.10-12:	Wind Direction and Relative Duration .....	5-231
5.10-13:	Incremental Cancer Risk .....	5-232
5.11-1:	Response Times Emergency Calls for Service .....	5-242
5.11-2:	Fire/EMS Emergency Response Times .....	5-246
5.11-3:	Student Generation Rates for the Proposed Project .....	5-250
5.11-4:	Park Acreage Per Population (Year 2000) .....	5-255
5.12-1:	Existing Water Demands .....	5-263
5.12-2:	Projected Water Supply and Demand During Normal Year for Period 2005 To 2030 .....	5-268
5.12-3:	Existing Citywide Wastewater Facility Data .....	5-271
5.12-4:	Population Travel and Fuel Use 1995–2030 – City of Chula Vista .....	5-279
5.13-1:	Matrix of Regulatory Agency Responsibility .....	5-298
7-1:	Increase in Population and Housing Units Over Existing Conditions .....	7-2
10-1:	Existing Zoning Distribution Within the UCSP Subdistricts Area .....	10-2
10-2:	Comparison of Projected Buildout for Reduced Project Alternative and Proposed UCSP .....	10-11
10-3:	Average Daily Emissions to the San Diego Air Basin .....	10-15

**PHOTOGRAPHS**

4-1: Third Avenue at H Street, Looking North .....4-3

4-2: Third Avenue at F Street, Looking South .....4-3

4-3: Fourth Avenue at F Street, Looking North .....4-4

4-4: Broadway at F Street, Looking South .....4-4

4-5: H Street at Third Avenue, Looking West.....4-5

4-6: Broadway at H Street, Looking North.....4-5

**APPENDIXES (bound under separate cover)**

A: Notice of Preparation and Responses

B: Cultural Resources Report for the Evaluation of the Historical and Architectural  
Significance of 50 Properties within the Chula Vista Urban Core

C: Traffic Report

D: Noise Report

E: Air Quality Report for the Urban Core Specific Plan

F: Water Supply Assessment, City of Chula Vista Urban Core Specific Plan

# 1.0 Executive Summary

## 1.1 Introduction

This summary provides a brief synopsis of: (1) the proposed Urban Core Specific Plan, (2) the results of the environmental analysis contained within this Environmental Impact Report (EIR), (3) the alternatives to the proposed plan that were considered, and (4) the major areas of controversy and issues to be resolved by decision-makers. This summary does not contain the extensive background and analysis found in the document. Therefore, the reader should review the entire document to fully understand the project and its environmental consequences.

The purpose of this Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) is to evaluate the environmental effects of the proposed City of Chula Vista Urban Core Specific Plan (UCSP). The UCSP includes proposed land use objectives, development regulations (zoning), and development design guidelines to implement the recently adopted General Plan Update (GPU) vision for the Chula Vista urban core. The UCSP land use development regulations and design guidelines would be used by the City to guide day-to-day decision-making regarding future proposals for new infill development and redevelopment of the urban core so that there is continuing progress towards attainment of plan objectives.

## 1.2 Project Description and Location

The subject of this Program EIR is a proposal to adopt and implement the UCSP which would govern the development and revitalization of the urban core of the City of Chula Vista. The City of Chula Vista is located in southern San Diego County, in the northwest portion of the City of Chula Vista, approximately 18 miles north of the U.S.-Mexico border and 135 miles south of Los Angeles. The urban core of Chula Vista encompasses approximately 1,700 acres of the traditional downtown area east of I-5, west of Del Mar Avenue, north of L Street, and south of C Street. Within this larger area is a smaller 690-gross-acre area, which was determined to be most in need of redevelopment due to conditions of blight and underutilization. This smaller area comprises the “Subdistricts Area” of the UCSP and is the focus of all the regulatory land use provisions of the UCSP. The new zoning, development standards, and design guidelines proposed in the UCSP will apply only to the Subdistricts Area of the UCSP. Existing zoning and land use regulations will not be changed in the remaining portion of the UCSP study area outside the Subdistricts Area. The remaining portion of the UCSP study area outside the Subdistricts Area consists of stable residential neighborhoods not expected to transition within the planning horizon of the UCSP, were not proposed for



change under the adopted GPU, and were thus excluded from the regulatory provisions of the proposed UCSP.

The proposed UCSP would refine and implement the vision for downtown Chula Vista expressed in the City's GPU (2005). As a comprehensive, city-wide document, the GPU's goals, objectives and policies are necessarily general. The proposed UCSP would fulfill the role of providing detailed neighborhood-specific land use and development regulations (zoning), development design guidelines, and numerous other mobility and public realm guidelines, incentives and programs to revitalize the urban core in accord with the general goals stated in the GPU. The UCSP would additionally serve as the basis for a variety of other actions, such as parkland acquisitions and transportation improvements.

Under the proposed UCSP, the urban core at buildout would consist of an integrated and connected network of three distinct neighborhoods and districts, including the Village, Urban Core and Corridors districts. (For planning purposes each of these three districts are divided into a total of 26 subdistricts). Each district would contain a mix of primarily low- to mid-rise (45 to 84 feet in height) high-density commercial, office, and residential uses and various public amenities such as improved pedestrian streetscapes, bicycle and transit facilities, public art, and parks, plazas and paseos. Two high-rise (up to 210 feet in height) Transit Focus Areas would be permitted in the areas surrounding the existing E and H Street trolley stations.

Adoption of the proposed UCSP would replace existing Municipal Code - Zoning for the Subdistricts Area with new zoning that permits increased number of buildings, with increased building heights and mass. This intensification of land use in the Subdistricts Area is planned to accommodate GPU-projected resident and employment populations. Ultimate buildout of the UCSP would allow 7,100 net new residential units over the existing 3,700 for a total of up to 10,800 dwelling units by year 2030. Commercial retail square footage would increase by up to 1 million square feet over the existing 3 million square feet for a total of up to 4 million square feet by 2030. Commercial office space would increase by up to 1.3 million square feet over the existing 2.4 million square feet for a total of up to 3.7 million square feet by 2030. In addition, up to 1.3 million square feet of new commercial visitor-serving uses would be allowed in the Subdistricts Area by 2030.

The UCSP land use regulations would supersede existing Municipal Code – Zoning as well as the land use guidelines of the existing redevelopment plan areas that overlap the UCSP Subdistricts Area. Specifically, the Town Centre I Redevelopment Plan would be amended for consistency with the UCSP; the Town Centre I Land Use Policy would be replaced with the UCSP Land Use Matrix and the Town Centre I Design Manual would be repealed to defer to the UCSP design guidelines.

## 1.3 Environmental Analysis

Section 21002 of CEQA requires that an environmental impact report identify the significant effects of a project on the environment and provide measures or alternatives that can mitigate or avoid those effects. This Program EIR contains an environmental analysis of the potential impacts associated with implementing the proposed UCSP. The major issues that are addressed in this Program EIR were determined to be potentially significant based on review by the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department and public comment received on the Notice of Preparation. The issues include land use, landform alteration and visual quality, cultural resources, geology and soils, paleontological resources, population and housing, hydrology and water quality, traffic, circulation and access, noise, air quality, public services, public utilities, and public health hazards. The impact analyses for each of these issues are included in Chapter 5.0. Chapter 9.0 of this Program EIR summarizes the potential environmental impacts that were not considered significant, consisting of biological, mineral, and agricultural resources.

Table 1-1, located at the end of this section, summarizes the potentially significant environmental impacts and proposed mitigation measures by major issue, as analyzed in Chapters 5.0 and 6.0 of this Program EIR. The last column of this table indicates whether the impact would be reduced to below a level of significance after implementation of proposed mitigation measures.

This Program EIR incorporates by reference previous environmental documents covering environmental issues relevant to the approval of the UCSP. The documents used during the preparation of this program EIR are noted in the text, where applicable, and are additionally listed in Chapter 11.0, References Cited, of this Program EIR. The documents are available for review in their entirety at the City of Chula Vista Planning and Building Department, 276 Fourth Avenue and the Chula Vista Civic Center Library at 365 F Street in the City of Chula Vista. Selected documents are additionally available for review on the City of Chula Vista's website documents page at [www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us](http://www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us).

## 1.4 Project Alternatives

Alternatives to the proposed project are evaluated in Chapter 10.0 of this EIR in terms of their ability to meet the primary objectives of the proposed project and eliminate or further reduce identified significant environmental effects. The alternatives considered are the No Project Alternative, the Reduced Project Alternative, and the Automobile Priority Alternative.

The No Project Alternative would continue to implement the existing Municipal Code - Zoning based on the former General Plan (1989). The Reduced Project Alternative would reduce development intensity by 25 percent throughout the UCSP Subdistricts Area compared to the proposed UCSP. The Automobile Priority Alternative would reprioritize proposed transportation improvement to maximize vehicle flow on area roadways and at area intersections. A comparative matrix of each of these alternatives is provided in Table 1-2, located at the end of this section.

## **1.5 Areas of Controversy and Issues to be Resolved**

In accordance with the requirements of Section 15123 (b) (2 and 3) of the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines, this section identifies the potential areas of controversy as well as any issues which will likely need to be resolved by decision-makers in relationship to the environmental effects of the proposed UCSP.

In the course of public meetings concerning the proposed UCSP, local citizens and organization have expressed concern regarding the following major environmental issues.

### **1.5.1 Land Use/Community Character**

Concern has been expressed by residents and surrounding neighborhoods regarding potential land use compatibility issues related to community and visual character, noise, and air quality. As discussed in Chapters 5.1 and 5.2 of this EIR, and summarized in Table 1-1, no significant impacts with respect to community and visual character are anticipated due to adequate vertical or horizontal separation between proposed high-density mid and high-rise uses and neighboring low-rise and/or single family residential uses. Relevant UCSP development regulations and design guidelines provide setbacks, stepbacks, screening, landscaping, building design and other measures to avoid or minimize adjacency issues such as architectural mass and form, aesthetics, solar access, ventilation, and other effects. The proposed UCSP permits primarily commercial and residential land uses, which are similar to and compatible with existing zoning and occupied land uses. The UCSP regulatory provisions would not permit new uses within the Subdistricts Area which may create substantial compatibility issues, and would not encourage the development of new uses surrounding the Subdistricts Area. The area surrounding the Subdistricts Area would remain subject to existing Municipal Code zoning provisions which allow low-rise residential uses in areas that are currently occupied by same.

The proposed UCSP allows for substantial intensification of existing land uses within the UCSP Subdistricts Area to accommodate a projected three-fold increase in population in

the area. The existing community and visual character of the area could potentially change from existing conditions of mostly low-rise (up to 48 feet in height) single-use commercial blocks surrounded by multi-family residential blocks, to a future mix of low-rise (up to 45 feet in height) and mid-rise (up to 84 feet in height) mixed-use commercial/office and residential blocks, with high-rise structures (up to 210 feet in height) allowed in the areas surrounding the existing E Street and H Street trolley stations. While these physical changes are considered substantial, they are not considered to be adverse, given adherence of individual future projects to UCSP development regulations and design guidelines. Provisions in the UCSP such as the provision of new mixed-use zoning classifications, paseos to provide walkable access to neighborhoods, reconnection of the street grid pattern in areas that have been previously disrupted, and linking of bikeways, sidewalks and urban plazas throughout the urban core, additionally serve to integrate the community rather than to physically divide it. The principles of smart growth, upon which the UCSP was developed, emphasize innovative mobility and land use planning tools to create a vibrant city center that is a combination employment/residential/commercial area with transit, recreational and other quality of life amenities that serve to create cohesive neighborhoods. While providing updated infrastructure and community amenities, smart growth principles also strive to preserve and enhance existing community character by building upon existing design themes and incorporating local culturally significant resources into plan design.

As discussed in Chapters 5.9 and 5.10 of this Program EIR, significant impacts on surrounding neighborhoods are not anticipated with respect to noise and air quality; however, significant noise and air quality impacts are anticipated for future uses within the Subdistricts Area. Increased vehicle traffic on area roadways would generate future noise levels adjacent to the roadways in excess of acceptable standards for noise sensitive uses such as residential units and outdoor recreation. Mitigation measures are provided in this Program EIR to ensure that future development within the UCSP Subdistricts Area reduces noise impacts to below significance. Prior to issuance of an Urban Core Development Permit or other discretionary permit, all future projects within the Subdistricts Area with the potential to be exposed to noise in excess of specified limits shall be required to complete applicable exterior and interior noise analyses and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City Community Development Director that project-specific design includes measures to reduce any noise impacts to below a level of significance.

Due to the San Diego Air Basin being in non-attainment for ozone and particulates, future air quality emissions, despite being projected to be lower than current emissions due to improved energy and transportation efficiencies, would be cumulatively significant. In addition, potentially significant air quality impacts would occur for future residents within 500 feet of Interstate 5 along the western edge of the Subdistricts Area due to projected diesel vehicle particulate (PM<sub>10</sub>) emissions emanating from the freeway. The UCSP contains special design guidelines for areas adjacent to Interstate 5 that

would lessen impacts; however impacts would remain cumulatively significant, avoidable only by source-control measures which are not the jurisdiction of the City of Chula Vista. Implementation of the proposed UCSP would also pose significant air quality impacts, as defined by CEQA, through inconsistency with the adopted Regional Air Quality Standards (RAQS) and State Implementation Plan (SIP). The goals and objectives of the SIP and RAQS were based upon the former General Plan designated land uses. The recently adopted GPU land uses are inconsistent with the former General Plan, and thus the SIP and RAQS. Because the proposed UCSP conforms to the adopted GPU, the UCSP is in significant conflict with an applicable air quality plan. The only measure that can lessen this impact is revision of the RAQS based on the recently adopted GPU. This effort is the responsibility of SANDAG and San Diego APCD and is outside the jurisdiction of the City of Chula Vista.

## **1.5.2 Traffic, Circulation, and Parking**

Surrounding neighborhoods and current residents/users of the urban core have expressed a concern that traffic and parking may increase in their neighborhoods due to the increased development potential under the proposed UCSP. As discussed in Chapter 5.8, traffic volumes on area roadways are anticipated to substantially increase by 2030. Roadway and intersection improvements are incorporated as mitigation measures in the proposed UCSP to avoid future impacts to 19 intersections and 2 roadway segments. However, despite these improvements, three intersections and one roadway segment would remain at unacceptable levels of service. The intersections include Broadway at H Street and Third Avenue and J Street within the Subdistricts Area, and Hilltop Drive and H Street within the study area. The affected street segment is Third Avenue between E and G Streets. Due to right-of-way constraints and conflict with the guiding principle of the UCSP to encourage modes of transport other than automobile, these impacts remain significant and unmitigated. The smart growth principles of the GPU are reflected in the change in mobility emphasis in the UCSP which places more emphasis on multi-modal opportunities including pedestrians, bicycling, public transit and less emphasis on the automobile. By design, the LOS for the indicated roadway segments and intersection would decline due to improvement in the streetscape to benefit pedestrians, cyclists and public transit users.

The UCSP development regulations include parking requirements for residential, guest and non-residential uses. A projected total of 18,560 parking spaces would be required to serve future development of the proposed UCSP at buildout. While the majority of new development will provide on-site parking, there are specific locations such as within the Village District and transit focus areas that allow some parking needs to be met off-site and/or through alternative means such as in-lieu fees and shared parking arrangements. A number of other parking improvement strategies are included in the UCSP such as parking buffers, parking districts and parking structures. Potential significant impacts to parking would be reduced to below significance by the

incorporation of these development regulations and design guidelines into subsequent development projects, as required as part of the UCSP design review process. Parking improvements will either be made on-site (i.e., where required of subsequent development projects), or off-site (i.e., in coordination with the City's Parking District or in Lieu Fee program. Given these UCSP provisions, future parking conditions were considered to be not significant.

### **1.5.3 Housing**

The issue of the effect of the proposed UCSP on housing has been raised with respect to the effect of urban core redevelopment on existing affordable housing in areas surrounding the commercial corridors and in surrounding neighborhoods. If property values increase in the urban core, property values in surrounding neighborhoods would likely increase, thereby increasing the cost of housing and rent. These concerns fall into the general category of socio-economic considerations and are not required by CEQA to be addressed in an EIR. Section 15131 (a) of the CEQA Guidelines indicates that "economic or social effects of a projects shall not be treated as significant effects on the environment." Affordable housing issues would only be addressed if they result in a physical change in the environment.

There are no issues related to affordability that would translate into unique physical changes in the environment. Nonetheless, given that Redevelopment Plans overlay the majority (approximately 70 percent) of the Subdistricts Area, provisions of California Redevelopment Law will continue to direct funding to low and moderate income housing. Twenty percent of funds generated through tax increment financing (fees collected within a redevelopment plan area) are required to be set aside for affordable housing. Due to future revitalized conditions within the Subdistricts Area and overlapping redevelopment plans, it is anticipated that more tax increment financing funds would be generated and made available to serve affordable housing needs.

The physical affects of construction of new housing are considered in this Program EIR in Chapter 5.6, Population and Housing. Development under the UCSP would result in a substantial increase in the population of Chula Vista because it would accommodate growth that is planned to occur locally. The UCSP would have a beneficial impact on planned population and housing through the implementation of "smart growth" principles, consistent with the GPU, by directing higher density and intensity development in areas in and around transit and commercial corridors, and on vacant and underutilized land, and would provide housing to help meet the regional housing needs as approved by the State Department of HCD and SANDAG. The development regulations and design guidelines of the UCSP are expected to protect existing, stable residential neighborhoods, reduce urban sprawl, and reduce the direct and indirect impacts of increased population and housing to below a level of significance. Development in accordance with the proposed UCSP would not displace substantial numbers of existing

housing or people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere because the overall number of housing units allowed by the UCSP would be sufficient within the area to accommodate the affected population. The UCSP proposes a net increase of up to 7,100 residential units over a 25-year period. During redevelopment of new residential units, existing occupants would be temporarily displaced. These short term effects were considered in this Program EIR to be not significant due to the continuous production of additional housing within the urban core and throughout Chula Vista which would ensure the provision of housing within the same area and would not require it elsewhere in San Diego county or neighboring counties.

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>LAND USE</b>				
<p><b>Local Plans Conformance.</b> The proposed UCSP has been prepared pursuant to the recently adopted City of Chula Vista General Plan Update (GPU) as an implementing regulatory document; and serves as the primary source for policies, guidelines and regulations that implement the community's vision for the urban core.</p> <p>The adopted GPU largely focused on the revitalization and redevelopment of western Chula Vista in accordance with smart growth principles. The broad objectives and policies described in the GPU have been refined and described at the neighborhood level in the UCSP. Chapter 11 (General Plan Implementation) of the GPU identifies the UCSP as a required element to implement the new land use designations, objectives, and policies identified for the urban core and specifically referenced in the Northwest Planning Area of the GPU. The proposed UCSP is thus consistent with the adopted GPU.</p> <p>The UCSP is also consistent with other local plans and policies that govern land use in the Chula Vista urban core, including the Merged Plan Redevelopment Plan, the Broadway Revitalization Strategy, and the Chula vista Historic Preservation Strategic Plan.</p>	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation



**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>LAND USE (cont.)</b>				
Implementation of the proposed UCSP would not affect the boundaries or authorities of the Merged Plan Redevelopment Plan (which overlaps a large portion of the UCSP Subdistricts Area) and provides additional provisions to meet Redevelopment Plan goals to revitalize and redevelop the blighted areas of the urban core. The UCSP is consistent with the Broadway Revitalization strategies for reversing deteriorating conditions along the auto-oriented Broadway strip and reforming the area into a commercially viable and visually pleasing environment . The UCSP also implements the strategies of the Historic Preservation Strategic Plan which identified several measures the City should undertake in order to more effectively achieve its historic preservation goals. Measures included in the Strategic Plan that are reflected in the proposed UCSP include the integration of historic preservation goals into land use policies, inventory of historic resources, and provision of incentives for historic preservation.				

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>LAND USE (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Local Zoning Conformance.</b> The proposed UCSP provides new zoning in conformance with the land use designations of the recently adopted GPU. The GPU identified the need to update the existing adopted Municipal Code zoning to conform to the GPU. The existing Municipal Code zoning for the urban core was established 30 years ago and is presently out of conformance with the GPU, and hence the proposed UCSP.</p> <p>In order to comply with State law and bring the zoning into conformance with the GPU, the UCSP proposes new zoning for the UCSP Subdistricts Area. The new zoning includes provisions for land uses, building intensity, form, mass, and height as recommended in the GPU. The stable neighborhoods that comprise the Study Area outside of the Subdistricts Area would not be subject to this new zoning and would continue to be governed by the existing Municipal Code zoning. Because the UCSP proposes to provide new zoning as a replacement for the existing Municipal Code zoning for the Subdistricts Area, as a required implementing action of the GPU, there would be no conflict.</p>	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>LAND USE (cont.)</b>				
<b>Regional Plans Conformance.</b> The proposed UCSP objectives and regulatory provisions generally conform to the various plans and policies developed to coordinate growth within the region. This includes the joint planning efforts of the City of Chula Vista and the County of San Diego for SANDAG's RCP, RTP and CMP which promote smart growth principles; the Regional Housing Program; and MTDB's Transit First studies. The UCSP is also consistent with the intent and goals of the SIP and RWQCB (discussed Air Quality and Hydrology and Water Quality summaries below). Therefore, the proposed UCSP would not result in a significant impact to regional plans.	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant
The proposed <b>discretionary actions</b> include amendment of the Town Centre I Redevelopment Plan to bring it into conformance with the GPU and UCSP. The action covered by this EIR addresses the deletion of the Town Centre I Redevelopment Plan land use regulations and repeal of its Land Use Policy and Design Manual. This action will bring the adopted redevelopment plan into consistency with the UCSP, thereby eliminating planning conflict between the two plans.	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>LAND USE (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Physically Divide a Community.</b> The proposed UCSP would apply new zoning to the limited “Areas of Change” identified in the recently adopted GPU (and equal to the UCSP “Subdistricts Area”) and would provide for the envisioned integration of existing neighborhoods while providing for new development along gateways and major transit corridors. The GPU EIR provided an evaluation of the community character impacts associated with the change in land use designations and concluded that the policies and objectives outlined in the GPU would limit impacts on community character, but were dependent of future zoning or specific plans. As an implementing document of the GPU, the UCSP would provide the intended development standards, design guidelines, program for urban amenities, and design review process which limit impacts on community character. In addition, many of the public realm elements identified in the UCSP Chapters V, Mobility, and Chapter VII, Public Realm Design Guidelines, such as provision of paseos to provide walkable access to neighborhoods, reconnecting the street grid pattern in areas that have been previously disrupted, and linking bikeways, sidewalks and urban plazas throughout the urban core, serve to integrate the community rather than to physically divide it.</p>	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>LAND USE (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Community Character.</b> Implementation of the proposed UCSP would result in the adoption of new zoning for the Subdistricts Area which would permit the development or redevelopment of up to 10,800 (or 7,100 net new) dwelling units, 4 million or (1 million net new) square feet of commercial retail space, 3.7 million (or 1.3 million net new) square feet of commercial office space, and 1.3 million square feet of net new commercial visitor-serving space upon buildout of the plan over the next 25 years.</p> <p>The UCSP proposes new mixed-use zoning classifications to replace existing single-use zoning classifications, in order to allow integration of residential and commercial uses in the same structure and neighborhood. These new zoning regulations and the development design guidelines of the UCSP aim to implement a vision for the Subdistricts Area that is substantially different in intensity and character than existing community character. Allowable building heights and floor area ratio (FAR) provided in the UCSP would allow taller and more massive structures to be built. Low-rise (up to 45 feet in height) residential and commercial single-use structures would be potentially replaced with mid-rise (45 feet to 84 feet in height) mixed-use (commercial/office/residential) structures; and in some cases high-rise structures up to 120 or 210 feet in height (only in the Subdistricts UC-12, UC-15 and UC-18).</p>	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>LAND USE (cont.)</b>				
The effects of this land use intensification would not necessarily be adverse, and in accordance with CEQA Guidelines Section 15382, it is not enough to conclude significance based on substantial change, but significance must be based upon the physical change being substantial and adverse. The built environment permitted through the UCSP land use and development regulations and design guidelines is one that builds upon the principles of smart growth and new urbanism. These principles emphasize innovative mobility and land use planning tools to create vibrant city centers that are a combination employment/residential/commercial area with transit, recreational and other quality of life amenities that serve to create cohesive neighborhoods. While providing updated infrastructure and community amenities, smart growth principles also strive to preserve and enhance existing community character by building upon existing design themes and incorporating local culturally significant resources into plan design.				

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>LAND USE (cont.)</b>				
The UCSP contains specific provisions to address issues of community character and adjacent land uses in its Neighborhood Transition Combining Districts (NTCDs) and Transit Focus Areas (TFAs), as well as in its special regulations and design guidelines for mixed-use development. The NTCDs apply to Subdistricts Area parcels adjacent to existing R-1 and R-2 residentially-zoned areas and provide additional setback, stepback, landscaping, lighting, fencing, screening and building design requirements to ensure that the character of redevelopment within the UCSP Subdistricts Area will be compatible with and will complement adjacent surrounding residential areas. The TFAs are centered around transit facilities and additionally provide requirements to conduct light and solar access, shadowing, and ventilation studies to assess effects on adjacent buildings and areas.				

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>LAND USE (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Land Use Compatibility.</b> Provisions in the UCSP such as siting requirements, height limitations, setback and stepback requirements of the NTCDs and TFAs, and design guidelines for new development and redevelopment within the Subdistricts Area, would ensure that new development would not result in construction of structures that are incompatible with existing and/or adjacent structures. In addition, the UCSP allows only multi-family residential and commercial land uses to occupy the Subdistricts. No industrial uses are permitted within the Subdistricts, except some categories of light industry upon approval of a Conditional Use Permit. Residential and commercial land uses are generally considered compatible. Due to the form-based approach of the UCSP land use and development regulations, and the market-driven, incremental nature of anticipated development, it is not possible to predict actual land use configuration in terms of adjacency. However, given the general compatibility of commercial land use with multi-family residential use, and the design guidelines and transitions district, it is concluded that land uses allowed in the UCSP will be generally compatible with adjacent uses.</p> <p>Land use compatibility issues related to noise, light/glare, shading/solar access, traffic, and public safety are addressed in the following respective summaries.</p>	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation



**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>LANDFORM/AESTHETICS</b>				
<p><b>Scenic Resources and Vistas.</b> The UCSP area does not contain any significant visual landform features such as rock outcroppings, trees, or mountains, nor any designated scenic roadways. A village archway to the traditional downtown area at H Street and Third Avenue comprises the only existing scenic resource within the UCSP area.</p> <p>In accordance with the GPU (Objective LUT 9), the proposed UCSP has identified four Primary Gateways within the UCSP Subdistricts Area. Additionally the UCSP proposes two Secondary Gateways. Primary and secondary gateways are scenic features which serve to facilitate movement and provide access to the urban core. Because there are no scenic vistas or designated scenic roadways within the UCSP boundary, and the UCSP establishes design standards to enhance the view corridors at the primary and secondary gateways while preserving and complementing the existing Third Avenue archway, no significant impacts to scenic vistas or scenic resources would result from implementation of the UCSP.</p>	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>LANDFORM/AESTHETICS (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Aesthetics/Visual Character.</b> The proposed UCSP allows for substantial intensification of existing land use and resulting urban visual character, through greater building heights and mass, to accommodate the three-fold increase in population projected for the urban core by the year 2030. Per the regulations and design guidelines of the UCSP, redevelopment and new development within the UCSP Subdistricts Area would change the existing visual character from mostly low-rise (up to 48 feet in height) single-use commercial blocks surrounded by multi-family residential blocks, to a mix of low-rise (up to 45 feet in height) and mid-rise (up to 84 feet in height) mixed-use commercial/office and residential blocks, with high-rise structures (up to 210 feet in height) allowed in the areas surrounding the existing E Street and H Street trolley stations. Existing visual character, blue sky views, solar access, ventilation, and glare/lighting conditions would be affected by this intensification in land use. While these changes are considered substantial, they are not considered to be adverse, given adherence to UCSP development regulations and design guidelines.</p> <p>The proposed UCSP contains the urban development regulations and design guidelines required in the GPU to achieve a high quality pedestrian-scaled environment consistent with policies in the GPU for the urban core. All subsequent development projects in the UCSP Subdistricts Area will be required to comply with the UCSP</p>	<p>To ensure avoidance of potential visual character impacts, all subsequent development projects in the UCSP Subdistricts Area will be required to comply with relevant UCSP provision, as follows:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 5.2.5-1:</p> <p>All subsequent development projects in the UCSP Subdistricts Area shall comply with UCSP development regulations and design guidelines which are necessary to reduce or avoid potential impacts to landform alteration and visual quality (including blue sky views, solar access, and ventilation), and which may include but not be limited to the special development regulations for mixed-use projects (p. VI-43), the NTCD and TFA regulations (p. VI-40), and the siting and architectural design guidelines for each district (Chapter VII). Prior to approval of a subsequent development project, the Community Development Director or Planning and Building Director of the City shall identify the specific provisions of the UCSP which shall be included in the conditions of approval in order to avoid or to reduce potential impacts to below significance.</p>	Potentially Significant	5.2.5-1	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS**  
**(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>LANDFORM/AESTHETICS (cont.)</b>				
development regulations (UCSP, Chapter VI) and development design guidelines (UCSP, Chapter VII) and other relevant provisions of the UCSP, as part of the design review process, in order to avoid or reduce potential visual character impacts to a level below significance. Therefore, the proposed UCSP would not result in a significant impact to the prevailing aesthetic character of the site or surrounding area.				

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>LANDFORM/AESTHETICS (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Light and Glare Effects.</b> As described above under the Aesthetics/Visual Character summary, the proposed UCSP would allow for a substantial intensification of existing land uses through taller building heights and greater building massing. Light sensitive activities (e.g. sleeping) could potentially be adversely impacted by light or glare in excess of baseline conditions due to buildout of the UCSP and intensification of land use. However, various provisions in the UCSP development regulations and design guidelines (UCSP Chapters VI and VII) serve to control light and glare sources and ensure that light pollution and glare would be minimal. The special regulations for mixed-use projects require that all mixed-use projects “minimize the effects of any exterior noise, odors, glare, and other potentially significant effects” (UCSP, Chapter VI, Section H, p. VI-44). For each UCSP District, a set of private development and public realm design guidelines (UCSP, Chapter VIII) include lighting requirements to reduce glare, exposure or brightness, angle and depth of field, and duration. Many lighting sources are encouraged to be timed or motion-sensitized.</p> <p>All subsequent development projects in the UCSP Subdistricts Area will be required to comply with the UCSP development regulations (UCSP, Chapter VI) and development design guidelines (UCSP, Chapter VII) and other relevant provisions of the UCSP, as part of the design review process, in order to avoid or reduce potential light and glare impacts to a level below significance. Therefore, the proposed UCSP would not result in a significant impact to the prevailing light and glare conditions of the site or surrounding area.</p>	<p>To ensure avoidance of potential light and glare impacts, all subsequent development projects in the UCSP Subdistricts Area will be required to comply with relevant UCSP provision, as follows:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 5.2.5-2:</p> <p>All subsequent development projects in the UCSP Subdistricts Area shall comply with UCSP development regulations and design guidelines which are necessary to reduce or avoid potential adverse impacts to light or glare and which may include but not be limited to the provisions included in section 5.2.3.3 a through e of this EIR. Prior to approval of a subsequent development project, the Community Development Director or Planning and Building Director of the City shall identify the specific provisions of the UCSP which shall be included in the conditions of approval in order to avoid or to reduce potential light and glare impacts to below significance.</p>	Potentially Significant	5.2.5-2	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>				
<p><b>Architectural Resources.</b> Eleven buildings or sites within the UCSP Subdistricts Area are currently designated or eligible to be designated as historically significant as defined in the CEQA Guidelines. Demolition or substantial alteration of these buildings as a result of future development in accordance with the proposed UCSP would comprise a significant historical architectural resources impact.</p> <p>The area around Third Avenue and F Street is considered the traditional heart of the City and includes important elements of the early residential and business activities of the City. The potential for the existence of other as yet unidentified historic properties is significant in light of the number of older commercial and residential structures throughout the UCSP Subdistricts Area. If significant historic resources occur among these unidentified structures, their loss or substantial alteration would comprise a significant historical architectural resources impact.</p> <p>Implementation of Mitigation Measures 5.3.5-1, 5.3.5-2 and 5.3.5-4 would reduce potential impacts to historic resources to below a level of significance. In some circumstances, the implementation of Mitigation Measure 5.3.5-3, which provides for documentation of an historic resource, would not mitigate significant impacts to a point where clearly no significant effect on the environment would occur. In that event, a potential impact to historic resources may be significant and unavoidable.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.3.5-1:</p> <p>For a structure listed on, or eligible for listing on, the Chula Vista List of Historic Sites or State and Federal historic registers, the project applicant shall retain the structure in-place and maintain, repair, stabilize, rehabilitate, restore, preserve or reconstruct the structure in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's <i>Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings</i> (1995), Weeks and Grimmer ("Secretary's Standards"). Prior to issuance of an Urban Core Development Permit (UCDP) or other discretionary permit, the project applicant shall prepare detailed construction plans under the supervision of a qualified architectural historian or historic architect for review and approval by the Community Development Director. The Community Development Director shall retain, at the project applicant's expense, a qualified historic architect to review the plans and to certify that the project will comply with the Secretary's Standards and would not result in the loss of the structure's listing, or eligibility for listing, on the City, State or Federal register of historic resources.</p>	Significant	5.3.5-1 through 5.3.5-4	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES (cont.)</b>				
	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.3.5-2:</p> <p>Where there is substantial evidence that it is not feasible for a structure listed on or eligible for listing on the Chula Vista List of Historic Sites or State or Federal historic registers to be retained in-place, the project applicant shall provide for relocation and maintenance, repair, stabilization, rehabilitation, restoration or preservation of the structure in a manner consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's <i>Standards for the Interior's Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties with Guidelines for Preserving, Rehabilitating, Restoring and Reconstructing Historic Buildings</i> (1995), Weeks and Grimmer ("Secretary's Standards") at a new location subject to the approval of the City. Prior to issuance of an Urban Core Development Permit (UCDP) or other discretionary permit, the project applicant shall prepare detailed relocation plans under the supervision of a qualified architectural historian or historic architect for review and</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES (cont.)</b>				
	approval by the Community Development Director. The Community Development Director shall retain, at the project applicant's expense, a qualified historic architect to review the plans and to certify that the project will comply with the Secretary's Standards and would not result in the loss of the structure's listing, or eligibility for listing, on the City, State or Federal register of historic resources.			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES (cont.)</b>				
	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.3.5-3:</p> <p>Where there is substantial evidence that it is not feasible for a structure listed on, or eligible for listing on, the Chula Vista List of Historic Sites or State or Federal historic registers to be retained in-place or to be relocated to another location satisfactory to the City, the project applicant shall:</p> <p>Provide for documentation of the historical structure before it is removed from the development site, including but not limited to photographic documentation of the exterior and interior of the structure, and "as built" drawings of the structure according to the standards of the Historic American Building Survey (HABS, Level I). Such historical documentation shall be provided to the CVRC or RCC, as applicable, before a demolition permit is issued by the City for the structure.</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation



**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES (cont.)</b>				
	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.3.5-4:</p> <p>For those structures 45 years or older and not previously evaluated, a determination of historic significance shall be made based on the significance criteria in Section 5.3.2 (and repeated below) prior to the issuance of a demolition permit</p> <p>(A) Is associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of California's history and cultural heritage;</p> <p>(B) Is associated with the lives of persons important in our past;</p> <p>(C) Embodies the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, region, or method of construction, or represents the work of an important creative individual, or possesses high artistic values; or</p> <p>(D) Has yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.</p> <p>If determined to be historically significant Mitigation Measure 5.3.5-2, 5.3.5-3 or 5.3.5-4 shall be implemented as applicable.</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Archaeological Resources.</b> The UCSP Subdistricts Area is mapped as having low sensitivity for the occurrence of archaeological resources. Although the likelihood of encountering significant archaeological resources and human remains is low, the potential does exist. In the unlikely event that prehistoric cultural materials are found during subsurface disturbance resulting from future developments, there would be a significant archaeological impact.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.3.5-5:</p> <p>The likelihood of encountering archaeological resources is low within the UCSP Subdistricts Area. The following mitigation shall only be applied to projects which involve subsurface excavation to the depth of greater than or equal to six feet, or for any project site that has not had substantial previous excavation. Prior to approval of any construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Permit, and Urban Core Development Permit, the Community Development Director shall verify that the requirements for Archaeological Monitoring and Native American monitoring, if applicable, have been noted on the appropriate construction documents.</p> <p>The applicant/developer shall submit documentation to the Community Development Director identifying the qualified Principal Investigator (PI) for the project and the names of all persons involved in the archaeological monitoring program, the areas to be monitored, and a construction schedule indicating when and where monitoring will occur.</p>	Significant	5.3.5-5	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES (cont.)</b>				
	<p>During construction, the monitor shall be present full-time during soil remediation and grading/excavation/trenching activities which could result in impacts to archaeological resources, and shall document field activity and in the case of any discoveries.</p> <p>In the event of a discovery, the Archaeological Monitor shall direct the contractor to temporarily divert trenching activities in the area of discovery and immediately notify the resident engineer or building inspector, as appropriate. The monitor shall immediately notify the PI (unless the Monitor is the PI) of the discovery and the PI and Native American representative, if applicable, shall evaluate the significance of the resource.</p> <p>If human remains are discovered, work shall halt in that area and the procedures set forth in the California Public Resources Code (Sec. 5097.98) and State Health and Safety Code (Sec. 7050.5) shall be undertaken.</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>GEOLOGY/SOILS</b>				
<p><b>Geologic Hazards.</b> The UCSP area is potentially subject to strong ground shaking by an earthquake along the active Rose Canyon fault zone, or other active faults in the region. The Subdistricts Area may additionally be subject to liquefaction along its western boundary. Compressible and expansive soils also have the potential to be encountered by future development throughout the Subdistricts Area. Buildout of the UCSP would result in an increase in housing, office space, retail space, and hotels that would be subject to these potentially significant seismic and soils hazards. Therefore, there would be a proportionate increase in personal and property damage as the population within the urban core increases.</p> <p>Implementation of project-specific mitigation measures would be required to reduce or avoid significant impacts resulting from groundshaking, liquefaction, and compressible and expansive soils.</p> <p>Construction on liquefiable soils could result in injuries or loss of property during ground shaking of sufficient magnitude and duration. Expansive soils within pavement, foundation, or slab subgrade could heave when wetted, resulting in cracking or failure of these development improvements. Development on compressible soils could potentially settle under increased load and damage structures, roads, and property.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.4.5-1</p> <p>Prior to the approval of each subsequent development project, the project applicant shall submit a comprehensive soil and geologic evaluation of the project site to the City Engineer and/or Building Official for review and approval. The evaluation shall be prepared by a licensed geotechnical engineer in order to identify site-specific conditions and to determine whether potential soil and geologic hazards exist on the site. The evaluation shall include, but not be limited to, a delineation of specific locations where liquefiable, compressive, and expansive soils would affect structural stability and where graded slopes would expose bedrock susceptible to instability. Liquefiable, expansive, or compressive soils shall be removed from the site and shall be replaced with compacted fill.</p>	Significant	5.4.5-1 & 5.4.5-2	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>GEOLOGY/SOILS (cont.)</b>				
	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.4.5-2:</p> <p>Prior to the issuance of a building permit for each subsequent development project, the City Building Official shall verify that the design of all structures proposed for a specific site comply with the requirements of all federal, state and local building codes and regulations governing earthquake safety and structural stability and with the standard practices of the Association of Structural Engineers of California.</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>				
<p><b><i>Paleontological Sensitivity.</i></b> The UCSP area contains a large expanse of moderate paleontological resource sensitivity. Exposure or disturbance of unnamed nearshore marine sandstone and the Linda Vista Formation would potentially significantly impact paleontological resources. Because the UCSP area is fully developed with urban uses, future grading would typically be minimal except in areas with sub-garages and sub-floors. Development proposed in areas of moderate sensitivity that propose to grade in excess of 2000 cubic yards and five feet deep will require mitigation.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.5-1</p> <p>Subsequent development projects that propose grading in excess of 2,000 cubic yards and five feet depth in areas of moderate sensitivity for paleontological resources shall be required to implement a pre-construction or construction monitoring program, or both, as a condition of approval. All mitigation programs shall be performed by a qualified professional paleontologist, defined here as an individual with a M.S. or Ph.D. in paleontology or geology who has proven experience in San Diego County paleontology and who is knowledgeable in professional paleontological procedures and techniques. Fieldwork may be conducted by a qualified paleontological monitor, defined here as an individual who has experience in the collection and salvage of fossil materials. The paleontological monitor shall always work under the direction of a qualified paleontologist.</p>	Significant	5.5-1	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)</b>				
	<p>Pre-construction mitigation. This method of mitigation is only applicable to instances where well-preserved and significant fossil remains, discovered in the assessment phase, would be destroyed during initial clearing and equipment move-on. The individual tasks of this program include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Surface prospecting for exposed fossil remains, generally involving inspection of existing bedrock outcrops but possibly also excavation of test trenches;</li> <li>2. Surface collection of discovered fossil remains, typically involving simple excavation of the exposed specimen but possibly also plaster jacketing of large and/or fragile specimens or more elaborate quarry excavations of richly fossiliferous deposits;</li> <li>3. Recovery of stratigraphic and geologic data to provide a context for the recovered fossil remains, typically including description of lithologies of fossil-bearing strata, measurement and description of the overall stratigraphic section, and photographic documentation of the geologic setting;</li> </ol>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)</b>				
	<p>4. Laboratory preparation (cleaning and repair) of collected fossil remains, generally involving removal of enclosing rock material, stabilization of fragile specimens (using glues and other hardeners), and repair of broken specimens;</p> <p>5. Cataloging and identification of prepared fossil remains, typically involving scientific identification of specimens, inventory of specimens, assignment of catalog numbers, and entry of data into an inventory database;</p> <p>6. Transferal, for storage, of cataloged fossil remains to an accredited institution (museum or university) that maintains paleontological collections (including the fossil specimens, copies of all field notes, maps, stratigraphic sections, and photographs); and</p> <p>7. Preparation of a final report summarizing the field and laboratory methods used, the stratigraphic units inspected, the types of fossils recovered, and the significance of the curated collection.</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation



**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)</b>				
	<p>Construction mitigation. Under this program, mitigation occurs while excavation operations are underway. The scope and pace of excavation generally dictate the scope and pace of mitigation. The individual tasks of a construction mitigation program typically include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monitoring of excavation operations to discover unearthed fossil remains, generally involving inspection of ongoing excavation exposures (e.g., sheet graded pads, cut slopes, roadcuts, basement excavations, and trench sidewalls);</li> <li>2. Salvage of unearthed fossil remains, typically involving simple excavation of the exposed specimen but possibly also plaster jacketing of large and/or fragile specimens, or more elaborate quarry excavations of richly fossiliferous deposits;</li> <li>3. Recovery of stratigraphic and geologic data to provide a context for the recovered fossil remains, typically including description of lithologies of fossil-bearing strata, measurement and description of the overall stratigraphic section, and photographic documentation of the geologic setting;</li> </ol>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS**  
**(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)</b>				
	<p>4. Laboratory preparation (cleaning and repair) of collected fossil remains, generally involving removal of enclosing rock material, stabilization of fragile specimens (using glues and other hardeners), and repair of broken specimens;</p> <p>5. Cataloging and identification of prepared fossil remains, typically involving scientific identification of specimens, inventory of specimens, assignment of catalog numbers, and entry of data into an inventory database;</p> <p>6. Transferal, for storage, of cataloged fossil remains to an accredited institution (museum or university) that maintains paleontological collections, including the fossil specimens, copies of all field notes, maps, stratigraphic sections and photographs; and</p> <p>7. Preparation of a final report summarizing the field and laboratory methods used, the stratigraphic units inspected, the types of fossils recovered, and the significance of the curated collection.</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>POPULATION/HOUSING</b>				
<p><b>Population Growth Inducement.</b> The UCSP would induce substantial population growth in the UCSP Subdistricts Area as planned for in the GPU, by providing development regulations and design guidelines which are intended to direct a portion of the growth which is expected to occur in the City to the Subdistricts Area. Between 2004 and 2030, the City's population is expected to increase by over 30 percent. Buildout of the Subdistricts Area over the next 25 years is anticipated to result in a total urban core population of 27,864 by 2030, an estimated increase of 18,318 or nearly triple the existing population.</p> <p>The proposed UCSP would have a beneficial impact on planned population and housing through the implementation of "smart growth" principles, consistent with the GPU, by allowing higher density and intensity development in areas in and around transit and commercial corridors, and on vacant and underutilized land. Therefore, the substantial population growth planned for the Subdistricts Area will not result in a significant impact.</p> <p>The secondary environmental impacts associated with increased population in the UCSP area (such as traffic, air quality, noise) are discussed in the respective topic summaries of this table and in the sections of this report.</p>	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS**  
**(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>POPULATION/HOUSING (cont.)</b>				
<b><i>Displacement of Housing.</i></b> The UCSP will not displace substantial numbers of existing housing necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere. The majority of the existing uses in the Subdistricts Area are low intensity commercial and offices uses, particularly along the major corridors of E Street, Broadway, H Street, and Third Avenue. The majority of new development in the Subdistricts Area is expected to replace these low-intensity non-residential uses with higher intensity, mixed-use development that will substantially increase the number of housing units. Housing that may be removed by individual projects completed in compliance with the UCSP does not necessitate the construction of housing elsewhere because the overall number of housing units would be accommodated with the UCSP. Therefore, the UCSP will not have a significant impact on the displacement of housing necessitating the construction or replacement of housing elsewhere.	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant
<b><i>Displacement of People.</i></b> The majority of new development in the Subdistricts Area is expected to replace existing low-intensity non-residential uses with higher intensity, mixed-use development that will substantially increase the number of housing units available to people who wish to reside in the project area. Although the removal of existing housing may result in a temporary displacement of some people, the displacement is not considered a significant impact because the numbers of units planned in the UCSP are sufficient to accommodate the affected population. Therefore, the UCSP will not have a significant impact on the displacement of substantial numbers of people necessitating the construction or replacement of housing elsewhere.	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

	Proposed UCSP			
Impact	Mitigation	SBM	MM	SAM
HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY				
<p><b><i>Surface and Ground Water Quality.</i></b></p> <p>Implementation of the proposed UCSP would allow a three-fold increase in population and associated intensification of existing urban land uses which would likely result in a substantial increase in direct runoff to drainage basins, municipal storm sewer systems, and eventual drainage to surface water and/or the ocean. This runoff will likely contain typical urban runoff pollutants such as sediment, pathogens, heavy metals, petroleum products, nutrients (phosphates and nitrates) and trash. This comprises a potentially significant long-term water quality impact.</p> <p>The potential long-term impacts to water quality which may result from implementation of the proposed UCSP would be required to be reduced to acceptable levels through the mandatory controls imposed by local, state, and federal regulations. In addition, selected provisions of the UCSP that allow and encourage native plant landscaping and sustainable building practices (water input and waste efficiencies, living roofs, bioswales, etc.) would potentially lessen future runoff volumes, flow rate and pollutant concentration.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.7-1:</p> <p>Prior to approval of subsequent individual development projects, compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations regarding water quality (e.g. JURMP, SUSMP, NPDES, SWPP, and City Development and Redevelopment Projects Storm Water Manual) shall be demonstrated to the satisfaction of the City Engineer.</p>	Significant	5.7-1 through 5.7-4	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY (cont.)</b>				
The construction activities of subsequent individual projects would also potentially cause short-term water quality impacts through direct discharge of pollutants, soil excavation/sedimentation, and through encountering of shallow groundwater during subfloor grading. This comprises a potentially significant short-term water quality impact.	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.7-2:</p> <p>Prior to approval of subsequent individual development projects, project applicants shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City Engineer that the proposed on-site storm drain systems fully mitigate drainage impacts and meet all federal, state, and regional water quality objectives and all City standards and requirements. Land development construction drawings and associated reports shall include details, notes, and discussions relative to the required or recommended Best Management Practices (BMPs). Permanent storm water BMP requirements shall be incorporated into the project design and all subsequent individual development projects are required to complete the applicable Storm Water Compliance Form and comply with the City of Chula Vista's Storm Water Management Standards Requirements Manual.</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY (cont.)</b>				
	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.7-3:</p> <p>The City of Chula Vista requires that all new development and significant redevelopment projects comply with the requirements of the NPDES Municipal Permit, Order No. 2001-01. According to said permit, all projects falling under the Priority Development Project Categories are required to comply with the Standard Urban Storm Water Mitigation Plans (SUSMP) and Numeric Sizing Criteria. Future projects shall comply with all applicable regulations, established by the United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), as set forth in the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit requirements for urban runoff and storm water discharge, and any regulations adopted by the City of Chula Vista pursuant to the NPDES regulations and requirements. Further, the applicant shall file a Notice of Intent (NOI) with the State Water Resource Control Board to obtain coverage under the NPDES General Permit for Storm Water Discharges Associated with Construction Activity and shall</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY (cont.)</b>				
	<p>implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPP) concurrent with the commencement of grading activities. The SWPP shall include both construction and post-construction pollution prevention and pollution control measures, and shall identify funding mechanisms for the maintenance of post-construction control measures.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 5.7-4:</p> <p>Prior to issuance of an Urban Core Development Permit or other discretionary permit, all subsequent individual development projects shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director, conformance with Mediterranean/indigenous landscaping and other relevant design recommendations provided in UCSP Chapter VII Development Design Guidelines.</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation



**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Groundwater Depletion.</b> The UCSP area does not overlie a productive groundwater recharge basin or aquifer recharge area. The San Diego Formation Aquifer, which underlies the UCSP area, is of marginal groundwater use because of poor quality due to saltwater intrusion from nearby San Diego Bay. Potable water supply to the UCSP area is, and will continue to be, provided by the Sweetwater Authority from a combination of local supply (obtained from eastern groundwater wells and a desalination facility) augmented by imported water purchased from the Metropolitan Water District. The Sweetwater Authority has verified availability of future water supplies to serve the proposed UCSP without depletion of groundwater resources (refer to Section 5.12.1). Therefore, impacts to groundwater resources availability resulting from implementation of the proposed UCSP would not be significant.</p>	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>HYDROLOGY/WATER QUALITY (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Drainage/Flooding.</b> The physical drainage pattern of the urban core will not be substantially altered by implementation of the UCSP. The UCSP area is highly urbanized, flat, paved with impervious surfaces, and contains very little vacant land. Development in accordance with the UCSP will not substantially alter this existing topography and associated drainage patterns.</p> <p>The three-fold increase in population and associated intensification of urban land uses allowed in the UCSP will increase surface runoff. When compared to existing conditions, however, land use associated with redevelopment and implementation of the UCSP is generally similar in nature, from a perspective of hydrologic response. Because the typical percentage of imperviousness for a given parcel of land is similar between the existing and redeveloped condition, implementation of the UCSP will result in minimal impacts to existing drainage infrastructure. In addition, proposed pavement improvements combined with sustainable building incentives will reduce drainage impacts. Thus, the existing drainage capacity would not be exceeded in a manner which would result in on- or off-site flooding, and drainage and flooding impacts are thus considered to be not significant.</p>	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION</b>				
<p><b>Road Segments and Intersections Level of Service.</b> A substantial increase in traffic on area roadways and at area intersections will result from planned population growth in the urban core area over the next 25 years. Without the intersection and roadway improvements envisioned in the proposed UCSP, by year 2030 conditions, 2 road segments and 19 intersections would operate at unacceptable LOS E or worse during peak traffic periods. This comprises a significant traffic impact prior to mitigation.</p> <p>The significant impacts to intersections will be mitigated to below significance by implementation of the improvements recommended in Mitigation Measure 5.8.5-1, with the exception of #27 Broadway/H Street, #33 Hilltop Drive/H Street and #54 Third Avenue/J Street. Impacts to these 3 intersections would remain significant and unavoidable</p> <p>Recommendations at intersections #27, #33, and #54 do not improve conditions to an acceptable LOS due to ROW and design constraints. The following describes the constraints at the three intersections:</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.8.5 -1:</p> <p>Intersection Improvements. Impacts to the 19 affected intersections will be mitigated to below significance by the implementation of improvements that have been divided into three tiers for phased implementation based on need and enhancement of the overall street network. Generally, time frames associated with the tiered improvements are anticipated as short-, mid- and long-term. In each tier, the City's existing TMP will determine the order in which projects are implemented during the biannual CIP program review. The Tier 1 improvements would be included in the current CIP and subsequently monitored for improvement within the first five years of implementation of the UCSP. It should be noted that three of the intersections (#7, #16, and #21) are proposed as project features rather than as needed to improve intersection LOS and most likely will be related to and timed with implementation of streetscape improvements along Third Avenue.</p>	Significant	5.8.5-1, 5.8.5-2, & 5.8.5-3	Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS**  
**(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION (cont.)</b>				
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>At the Broadway/H Street intersection (#27), an additional northbound and southbound through lane would be required in order to achieve an acceptable LOS D conditions. However, this improvement would require extensive widening of Broadway and H Street to allow for lane drops. Furthermore, this widening would create longer pedestrian crossings. As such, the recommended improvements of the eastbound queue jumper lane and the additional westbound through and right-turn lanes would improve the intersection from LOS F to LOS E conditions.</li> <li>At the Hilltop Drive/H Street intersection (#33), no improvements would be recommended due to ROW constraints. The poor LOS at this intersection is primarily caused by the high traffic volumes in the eastbound/westbound movements. Additional through and/or turn lanes would be required in order to improve this intersection to an acceptable LOS. With no improvements, this intersection would remain at LOS E during both peak periods.</li> <li>At the Third Avenue/J Street intersection (#54), the required improvement of an additional southbound right-turn lane would impact the existing commercial building (Henry's Marketplace), which is built adjacent to the sidewalk. Therefore, this improvement is not recommended. As a result, the LOS would remain at LOS E. However, if the property were to redevelop in the future, additional ROW could be obtained for the southbound right-turn lane.</li> </ul>	<p>The intersection numbers in the improvements described below correspond to the intersection numbering system used in the TIA (Appendix C of this EIR):</p> <p>a. Tier 1 Improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>#1 Bay Boulevard/I-5 Southbound Ramp/E Street: Add an eastbound through and right-turn lane, southbound right-turn lane, and northbound right-turn lane. Coordination with Caltrans will be required for this improvement.</li> <li>#2 I-5 Northbound Ramp/E Street: Add a westbound right-turn lane. Coordination with Caltrans will be required for this improvement</li> <li>#7 Third Avenue/E Street: Convert the northbound and southbound shared right-through lane into exclusive right-turn lanes.</li> <li>#16 Third Avenue/F Street: Separate the southbound shared through-right lane into an exclusive through and right-turn lanes, convert the northbound shared through-right lane into an exclusive right-turn lane.</li> </ul>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION (cont.)</b>				
<p>The potential significant impacts to street segments will be mitigated to below significance by implementation of the improvements recommended in Mitigation Measure 5.8.5-2, with the exception of Third Avenue between E and G Streets. The significant and unavoidable impact to this street segment result from the design of the project, which is intended to reduce Third Avenue to a two-lane downtown promenade to facilitate an enhanced pedestrian environment along the traditional commercial village. Although the planned improvements would result in an unacceptable LOS, they would meet the project objectives of creating a more pedestrian friendly and active streetscape that will accommodate multi-modes of transportation rather than accommodating only the automobile.</p> <p>Development of alternative modes of transportation to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, and public transit, as planned for by the UCSP, will increase alternate forms of mobility by introducing traffic calming elements, pedestrian improvements and paseos. In addition, the reintroduction of the street grid, West Side Shuttle and future regional transit improvements that are planned to serve the Urban Core will serve to offset traffic impacts related to automobile use within the UCSP.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #21 Third Avenue/G Street: Convert the northbound/southbound shared through-right lane into exclusive right-turn lanes.</li> <li>• #24 I-5 Southbound Ramp/H Street: Add a southbound left, eastbound through and right-turn lanes. Coordination with Caltrans will be required for this improvement.</li> <li>• #25 I-5 Northbound Ramp/H Street: Add a westbound through and right-turn lane and restripe south approach to accommodate dual left-turn lanes. Coordination with Caltrans will be required for this improvement.</li> <li>• #26 Woodlawn Avenue/H Street: Change Woodlawn Avenue to a one-way couplet. This improvement is required to serve the intense redevelopment occurring on both sides of H Street. The couplet improvement is not required mitigation further north toward E Street.</li> </ul>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION (cont.)</b>				
<p>While existing TransNet funding is expected to cover some of the costs of roadway and transit improvements and existing traffic signal fees currently collected as new development occurs would be applied, as appropriate, to identified signal-phasing improvements, the Facilities Implementation Analysis (FIA) has identified proposed development fees that may be needed to fund some of the recommended traffic improvements. In addition, some of the improvements will require right of way dedications either as part of the development process or concurrent with capital improvements, and/or coordination with Caltrans.</p> <p>Due to the long-term nature of some of the improvements, the fee program and coordination have either not been implemented or begun, respectively, whereas the right of way exactions would occur with redevelopment. While these improvements are intended to be implemented when necessary and within the Tiers noted above, their long-term implementation cannot be assured at this time. Identified significant impacts will be partially mitigated but due to the lack of funding assurances at this time, future coordination with CALTRANS and SANDAG, and future right of way exactions, impacts are considered significant and unmitigated.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #27 Broadway/H Street: Add an eastbound transit queue jumper lane and westbound through and right-turn lanes.</li> <li>• #28 Fifth Avenue/H Street: Change the northbound/southbound approaches to include protective plus permissive phasing and add a westbound right-turn lane.</li> <li>• #29 Fourth Avenue/H Street: Add an eastbound/westbound right-turn lane.</li> <li>• #44 Fourth Avenue/SR-54 Eastbound Ramp: Add an eastbound right-turn lane. Coordination with Caltrans will be required for this improvement.</li> </ul> <p>b. Tier 2 Improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #34 Broadway/SR-54 Westbound Ramp: Add a westbound right-turn lane. Coordination with Caltrans will be required for this improvement.</li> <li>• #59 J Street/I-5 Northbound Ramp: Add an eastbound left-turn and westbound right-turn lane. Coordination with Caltrans will be required for this improvement.</li> </ul>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION (cont.)</b>				
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #61 L Street/Bay Boulevard: Signalize the intersection, add a southbound left-turn lane, and a northbound right-turn overlap phase to the traffic signal.</li> <li>• #63 Bay Boulevard/I-5 Southbound Ramp: Signalize the intersection. Coordination with Caltrans will be required for this improvement.</li> <li>• #64 Industrial Boulevard/I-5 Northbound Ramp: Signalize the intersection. Coordination with Caltrans will be required for this improvement.</li> <li>• H Street from four lanes to six lanes from I-5 to Broadway</li> </ul> <p>c. Tier 3 Improvements</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• #13 Broadway/F Street: Add an eastbound right-turn lane.</li> <li>• #45 Fourth Avenue/Brisbane Street: Add a southbound right-turn overlap phase to the traffic signal.</li> <li>• #57 Second Avenue/D Street: Convert to an all-way stop controlled intersection.</li> </ul>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION (cont.)</b>				
	On an annual basis during buildout of the UCSP, the City shall apply the TMP to monitor actual performance of the street system in the Subdistricts Area by conducting roadway segment travel time studies in accordance with the City's Growth Management Program and Traffic Threshold Standards. The results of the annual study under the TMP will be used by the City to determine the timing and need for implementation of improvements to the nineteen intersections identified above as having potential significant impacts. The City shall implement the intersection improvements in phases based on the results of the annual TMP and on need and enhancement to the function of the overall street network. In addition to determining timing and need, this systems and operations monitoring approach should also be used to further ascertain final design details of the intersection improvements and may include consideration of the effects on traffic flow as well as the impacts/benefits to other travel modes (e.g., pedestrians and bicycles) that are foundational to the successful implementation of the Specific Plan.			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation



**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION (cont.)</b>				
	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.8.5-2: Segment Improvements. During build-out of the UCSP, the City shall apply the Traffic Monitoring Program (TMP) to monitor actual performance of the street system in the Subdistricts Area by conducting roadway segment travel time studies in accordance with the City's Growth Management Program and Traffic Threshold Standards. The results of the annual study under the TMP will be used by the City to determine the timing and need for implementation of improvements to the street segments identified as having potential significant impacts. The City shall implement the following street segment improvements: 1) based on the results of the annual TMP; or 2) based on need and enhancement to the function of the overall street network; and 3) in a manner that efficiently implements with phasing of necessary adjacent intersection improvements.</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION (cont.)</b>				
	<p>1) H Street between I-5 and Broadway would be reclassified as a six-lane gateway. As a result, the acceptable ADT would increase and result in an acceptable LOS.</p> <p>2) Third Avenue between E Street and G Street would be constructed as a two-lane downtown promenade to facilitate an enhanced pedestrian environment along the traditional commercial village. As a result, the acceptable ADT along the segment would decrease and result in an unacceptable LOS. As such, impacts to Third Avenue will be significant and unavoidable. However, the Third Avenue corridor intersections at E, F and G Streets would all operate at an acceptable LOS.</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION (cont.)</b>				
	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.8.5- 3:</p> <p>Prior to issuance of an Urban Core Development Permit, subsequent development projects shall prepare a traffic assessment to quantify the projects' potential traffic impacts. Subsequent projects will be required to contribute their fair share to the Tiered Improvements listed above under Mitigation 5.8.5.1. Mitigation may be in the form of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>3) Payment of Transportation Development Impact Fee (TDIF), as may be established in the future for the western portion of the City;</li> <li>4) Payment of existing Traffic Impact Signal Fee;</li> <li>5) Construction of improvements within the project boundaries; and/or</li> <li>6) Early advancement of improvements beyond the project boundaries, subject to a reimbursement agreement.</li> </ul>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION (cont.)</b>				
	The City's TDIF program for the west side of the City, including the Urban Core is anticipated to be developed within the subsequent twelve months following adoption of the UCSP. The TDIF will clearly establish the costs of the improvements identified above as well as the fair share costs to be applied to all subsequent development projects. Once the TDIF has been established, the fee will be consistently applied to all subsequent development projects, until such time that the TDIF is amended or rescinded. In the interim, if subsequent development projects are processed and approved prior to the establishment of a TDIF, a condition of approval will be included that prior to issuance of building permits the project will contribute to the TDIF, as may be established.			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Pedestrian, Bicycling and Public Transit.</b> The hierarchy of emphasis of different forms of mobility in the proposed UCSP is to accommodate pedestrians first, then bicyclists, public transit, and finally, the automobile. Through the introduction of traffic calming element, pedestrian improvements and paseos, the UCSP provides for an enhanced pedestrian environment in the UCSP area. Provisions of the UCSP, in concert with the City Bikeway Master Plan, address deficiencies in the bikeway network and recommend new and upgraded bikeway facilities throughout the area for both recreational and commuting users. The proposed UCSP thus serves to benefit, rather than to deteriorate, mobility conditions for pedestrians and bicyclists and does not conflict with any adopted plans or programs supporting alternative transportation.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.8.5-4: Prior to issuance of an Urban Core Development Permit for subsequent development projects, the traffic assessment prepared to quantify the projects' potential traffic impacts will also identify how alternative modes of transportation will be accommodated. Mitigation may be in the form of:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Compliance with the development regulations and design guidelines of the UCSP to accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists and public transit; and</li> <li>2) Where applicable, construction of improvements within the project boundaries; and/or</li> <li>3) Early advancement of improvements beyond the project boundaries, subject to a reimbursement agreement.</li> </ol>	Potentially Significant	5.8.5-4	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION (cont.)</b>				
<p>The three-fold increase in population projected for the UCSP Subdistricts Area by 2030 would place greater demands on public transit services. A number of new and better regional transit improvements are already planned that will adequately serve the UCSP area. In addition, the UCSP incorporates smart growth strategies to lessen automobile use and increase public transit and other mobility use by providing a mix of compatible land uses, locating highest density near transit stations, utilizing compact building design and creating walkable and bikeable communities. A West Side Shuttle is also proposed to serve both the UCSP and the nearby Bayfront, which would complement existing and planned future transit improvements.</p> <p>Impacts to alternative forms of transportation as a result of the proposed UCSP would thus not be significant nor adverse given adherence of subsequent projects to relevant regulations and guidelines of the UCSP.</p>				

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>TRAFFIC/CIRCULATION (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Parking.</b> The UCSP allows for an intensification of development in the urban core which will create an increased demand for off-street parking. The Land Use and Development Regulations of the UCSP include parking requirements that specify parking locations and the number of parking spaces per land use. A projected total of 18,560 parking spaces would be required to serve future development of the proposed UCSP at buildout. While the majority of new development will provide on-site parking, there are specific location such as within the Village District and transit focus areas that allow some parking needs to be met off-site and/or through alternative means such as in-lieu fees and shared parking arrangements. In addition, a number of other parking improvement strategies are included in the UCSP including raking buffers, parking districts and parking structures.</p> <p>Potential significant impacts to parking would be reduced to below significance by the incorporation of these development regulations and design guidelines into subsequent development projects, as required as part of the UCSP design review process. Parking improvements will either be made on-site (i.e. where required of subsequent development projects), or off-site (i.e. in coordination with the City's Parking District or in Lieu Fee program).</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.8.5-5: Prior to issuance of an Urban Core Development Permit, subsequent development projects shall comply with the parking standards set forth in the UCSP development regulations and design guidelines for the type and intensity of development proposed.</p>	Potentially Significant	5.8.5-5	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>NOISE</b>				
<p><b>Exterior Noise.</b> The UCSP would result in a significant exterior noise impact because it would result in exposure of receivers in the UCSP area to exterior noise levels that exceed the levels established by the GPU and the City's noise control ordinance. The noise threshold include exterior limits of 65 CNEL in residential areas, outdoor use areas, neighborhood parks, and playgrounds, 70 CNEL in office and professional areas, or 75 decibels for retail and wholesale commercial areas, restaurants, and movie theaters.</p> <p>The siting of future parks has the potential to result in significant impacts. While park sites have not been designated, it is possible that parks could be sited next to circulation element roadways which generate noise in excess of 65 [to 70] decibels. This would be a significant impact and would require mitigation. Mitigating this impact would require the construction of noise barriers. Required barrier heights may be achieved through the construction of walls, berms, or wall/berm combinations. While noise levels at a park site would be reduced by the construction of noise barriers, these barriers are incompatible with park uses.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.9-1:</p> <p>Exterior Noise Mitigation Measure. Prior to the approval of individual development projects, projects within the UCSP area shall demonstrate that required outdoor usable open space areas are adequately shielded from transportation related noise sources so that noise levels fall below the standards set by the General Plan Update (see Figure 5.9-1 and Table 5.9-1). Noise reduction measures may include building noise-attenuating berms, walls or other attenuation measures. Future development of park facilities shall also, to the extent feasible, incorporate mitigation measures such as siting, berms, walls or other attenuation measures to reduce impacts to acceptable levels of 65-70 CNEL or less. Indication that noise levels fall below this limit shall be made to the satisfaction of the Planning and Building Director, Building Official or Community Development Director.</p>	Significant	5.9-1	Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation



**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>NOISE (cont.)</b>				
	Because the only mitigation available to reduce exterior noise impacts to parks resulting from roadway traffic is the insertion of a barrier between the source (traffic) and receiver (park), and because parks are intended to remain open (i.e., not surrounded by walls) to the community, exterior noise impacts cannot be fully mitigated. There are no feasible mitigation measures available to mitigate for the potential for parks that are to be sited next to circulation element roadways which generate noise in excess of 65-70 CNEL. Therefore, exterior noise impacts remain significant and unmitigated.			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>NOISE (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Interior Noise.</b> The adoption of the UCSP would have a significant noise impact prior to mitigation because it would result in interior noise levels that exceed 45 dB CNEL due to exterior sources for habitable rooms in residences.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.9-2:</p> <p>Interior Noise Mitigation Measure. Prior to the approval of subsequent individual development projects, for any residential use immediately adjacent to a circulation element roadway, trolley or rail line, or Interstate 5, an acoustical analysis shall be completed demonstrating to the satisfaction of the Planning and Building Director, Community Development Director or Building Official, that interior noise levels due to exterior sources are 45 CNEL or less in any habitable room. For residential projects where interior noise levels due to exterior noise sources exceed 45 CNEL, architectural and structural considerations such as improved window and door acoustical performance, shall be identified.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 5.9-3:</p> <p>Interior Noise Mitigation Measure. Prior to the approval of individual development projects, projects where it is necessary for the windows to remain closed to ensure that interior noise levels meet the City's and the Building Code interior standard of 45 CNEL shall demonstrate that the design for these units includes a ventilation or air conditioning system which provides a habitable interior environment with the windows closed.</p>	Significant	5.9-2 and 5.9-3	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>NOISE (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>City Noise Ordinance.</b> Until specific uses are identified, conformance to the City's noise control ordinance code cannot be assured and impacts associated with this criterion are significant.</p> <p>The UCSP would result in a significant noise impact because it would result in exposure of receivers in the UCSP area to exterior noise levels that exceed the levels established by the City's noise control ordinance. These include exterior limits of 65 CNEL in residential areas, outdoor use areas, neighborhood parks, and playgrounds, 70 CNEL in office and professional areas, or 75 decibels for retail and wholesale commercial areas, restaurants, and movie theaters.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.9-4:</p> <p>Noise Ordinance Mitigation Measure. Prior to the approval of individual development projects, commercial uses that may involve noise producing activities shall demonstrate compliance with the existing performance standards provided in the City's Noise Ordinance (Chapter 19.68.010 of the Municipal Zoning Code). Prior to project approval, subsequent projects shall also demonstrate compliance with the mixed-use provisions of Chapter VI of the UCSP that include minimization of the effects of any exterior noise impacts and provision of "internal compatibility between the different uses within the project" (UCSP, VI-44).</p>	Significant	5.9-4	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>AIR QUALITY</b>				
<p><b><i>Air Quality Plan Consistency.</i></b> The land uses proposed in the UCSP conform to the adopted GPU and are inconsistent with the former General Plan upon which the State Implementation Plan (SIP) and Regional Air Quality Standards (RAQS) were based. By changing land use designations in certain areas, the recently adopted GPU failed to conform with the growth projections used by SANDAG in their generation of the air quality management plan.</p> <p>Measures have been incorporated into the proposed UCSP to lessen air quality impacts. The UCSP has been prepared using the smart growth principles foundational to the General Plan such as providing a mix of compatible land uses; locating highest density near transit; utilizing compact building design and creating walkable communities; providing a range of infill housing opportunities; and increasing transportation choices. In particular, the UCSP focuses new development at key transit nodes and enhances alternative modes of travel by promoting walkability with enhanced pedestrian paths, augmenting existing bicycle paths, and making public transit more accessible and desirable with new and expanded public transit stops.</p>	<p>The only measure that can lessen this impact to a level below significance is the review and revision of the RAQS based on the recently adopted GPU. Since the updating of the air plan is outside of the authority of the City, no mitigation is available to the City to avoid this impact. Nonetheless, the City will cooperate with SANDAG and APCD in developing updated RAQS to insure their conformance with the adopted GPU and mitigation measure 5.10.5-1 is provided as an advisory measure.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 5.10.5-1:</p> <p>The City of Chula Vista shall recommend to SANDAG to update the RAQS in the next triennial cycle to incorporate the increased land use densities of the GPU and UCSP.</p>	Significant	5.10.5-1	Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>AIR QUALITY (cont.)</b>				
<p>However, since the GPU is inconsistent with the former General Plan upon which the goals and objectives of the RAQS were based, and the proposed UCSP conforms to the GPU, adoption of the proposed UCSP would result in significant conflict with an applicable air quality plan. This is a significant adverse impact.</p> <p>Because the significant air impact stems from an inconsistency between the land uses envisioned in the currently adopted GPU and the former General Plan upon which the RAQS were based, the only measure that can lessen this impact is the review and revision of the RAQS based on the recently adopted GPU. The RAQS are updated every three years, and will be updated again in 2007. This effort is the responsibility of SANDAG and APCD and is outside the jurisdiction of the City. The City will cooperate with SANDAG and APCD in developing updated RAQS to insure their conformance with the adopted GPU.</p>				
<p><b>Air Quality Standard Violation.</b> There are no existing or projected air quality violations in the UCSP area. Furthermore, there are no toxic air emitters proposed as part of the UCSP. All proposed land uses are either multi-family residential, commercial, retail or public uses, and no industrial uses are proposed. Therefore, there will not be a significant contribution to an existing or projected air quality violation, and no significant impact relative to this criterion.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>AIR QUALITY (cont.)</b>				
<p><b><i>Cumulatively Considerable Net Increase.</i></b> The proportional increase in multi-family units to single-family units proposed in the UCSP and resulting decrease in number of vehicle trips per unit, and the anticipated improvement in motor vehicle emissions, result in an expected decrease in pollutants over existing conditions for all criteria pollutants except SO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub>. Since the region is not in compliance with the PM<sub>2.5</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> standard, and because the average daily emission is anticipated to increase, impacts are considered significant, until the region is in compliance.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.10.5-2:</p> <p>Prior to issuance of an Urban Core Development Permit or other discretionary permit, all subsequent individual development projects shall demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director, conformance with the relevant land use and development regulations (UCSP, Chapter VI) and development design guidelines (UCSP, Chapter VII) of the UCSP which support smart growth principles such as providing a mix of compatible land uses; locating highest density near transit; utilizing compact building design and creating walkable communities; providing a range of infill housing opportunities; and increasing transportation choices.</p>	Significant	5.10.5-2 and 5.10.5-3	Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>AIR QUALITY (cont.)</b>				
<p>Cumulative increases in emissions in criteria pollutants for which the SDAB is not in attainment, would result from short-term construction of projects in conformance with the UCSP and from long-term emissions generated by both stationary and mobile sources within the UCSP area. Stationary source pollutant emissions would include those generated by the consumption of natural gas and electricity and the burning of wood in residential fireplaces. Vehicle traffic on area roads would generate mobile source emissions including carbon monoxide, nitrogen oxides, and hydrocarbons. Mitigation is achievable for fugitive dust from short-term construction activities, but the only measures that would reduce those emissions from long-term daily operations are those that reduce vehicle miles traveled on area roads. The UCSP includes measures aimed at promoting alternative modes of travel including enhanced pedestrian and bicycle activity, use of transit and reducing trip lengths by siting highest density adjacent to key transit nodes. Implementation of mitigation measures will ensure that conformance to these provisions of the UCSP is satisfied prior to issuance of subsequent project development permits.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.10.5-3:</p> <p>Prior to issuance of an Urban Core Development Permit or other discretionary permit, all subsequent individual development projects shall demonstrate compliance with relevant land use and development regulations contained in the UCSP to minimize air pollutant emissions. These include, but are not limited to: measures aimed at promoting pedestrian activity (Chapter V, pp. V-2- V-5); bicycle activity (Chapter V, pp. V-5 – V-7, V-9 – V-10); public transit facilities (Chapter V, pp. V-8 – V-9), including the West Side Shuttle (Chapter V, pp. V-11 – V-12); and reintroduction of the traditional street grid (Chapter V, pp. V-16 – V-19).</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>AIR QUALITY (cont.)</b>				
	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.10.5-4:</p> <p>Prior to issuance of construction permits, including but not limited to, the first Grading Permit, Demolition Permit, and Urban Core Development Permit, the Community Development Director shall verify that the following active dust control practices are to be employed during construction:</p> <p>1. All unpaved construction areas shall be sprinkled with water or other acceptable San Diego APCD dust control agents during dust-generating activities to reduce dust emissions. Additional watering or acceptable APCD dust control agents shall be applied during dry weather or windy days until dust emissions are not visible.</p> <p>2. Trucks hauling dirt and debris shall be properly covered to reduce windblown dust and spills.</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation



**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>AIR QUALITY (cont.)</b>				
	<p>3. A 20-mile-per-hour speed limit on unpaved surfaces shall be enforced.</p> <p>4. On dry days, dirt and debris spilled onto paved surfaces shall be swept up immediately to reduce resuspension of particulate matter caused by vehicle movement. Approach routes to construction sites shall be cleaned daily of construction-related dirt in dry weather.</p> <p>5. On-site stockpiles of excavated material shall be covered or watered.</p> <p>6. Disturbed areas shall be hydroseeded, landscaped, or developed as quickly as possible and as directed by the City and/or APCD to reduce dust generation.</p> <p>7. To the maximum extent feasible heavy-duty construction equipment with modified combustion/fuel injection systems for emissions control shall be utilized during grading and construction activities and catalytic reduction for gasoline-powered equipment shall be used.</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>AIR QUALITY (cont.)</b>				
	<p>8. Equip construction equipment with prechamber diesel engines (or equivalent) together with proper maintenance and operation to reduce emissions of nitrogen oxide, to the extent available and feasible.</p> <p>9. Electrical construction equipment shall be used to the extent feasible.</p> <p>10. The simultaneous operations of multiple construction equipment units shall be minimized (i.e., phase construction to minimize impacts).</p> <p>With the application of these measures, significant impacts resulting from projected PM<sub>10</sub> impacts from construction would be mitigated. Impacts resulting from daily operation would remain significant until the region is determined to be in compliance with the standard.</p>			

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

	Proposed UCSP			
Impact	Mitigation	SBM	MM	SAM
<b>AIR QUALITY (cont.)</b>				
<p><b><i>Sensitive Receptors.</i></b> Although there is no adopted standard for sensitive receivers adjacent to Interstate 5, it was determined that air quality impacts from diesel particulates emanating from Interstate 5 would be cumulatively significant given current basin-wide noncompliance with particulate standards and projected future levels of diesel particulates emanating from Interstate 5.</p> <p>The project area is not exposed to an incremental cancer risk of greater than 10 in 1,000,000 from a major toxic emitter. Furthermore, CO concentrations do not exceed the California or federal ambient air quality standards for carbon monoxide, and predictive modeling demonstrates that future traffic volumes can operate without exposing people to substantial CO concentrations. The analysis conducted for the UCSP indicates that there will not be CO hotspots as a result of the buildout of the UCSP. Conformance to Policy LUT 13.2 of the GPU requiring the optimization and maintenance the performance of the traffic signal system and the street system, to facilitate traffic flow and to minimize vehicular pollutant emission levels will ensure that intersections operate at an adequate level of service to avoid potential CO concentrations in excess of adopted standards. Projected CO levels are thus considered to be not significant.</p>	Cumulatively significant diesel particulate impacts would be reduced through mitigation measures 5.10-5-2 and 5.10.5-3 above, but not to below a level of significance.	Significant	5.10.5-2 and 5.10.5-3.	Significant
<p><b><i>Objectionable Odors.</i></b> The UCSP does not propose uses that would create a significant odor impact, nor does it place a sensitive user in an area exposed to objectionable odors.</p>	No mitigation is required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES</b>				
<p><b>Law Enforcement.</b> Future development in accordance with the proposed UCSP would result in a significant impact to law enforcement services because of the anticipated increase in calls for service and the additional travel time required to answer these calls. While the police facility at Fourth Avenue and F Street is sufficient to meet the law enforcement needs created by increased demand resulting from development, more police officers will be needed in order to maintain response times. Significant impacts would result if timing of these provisions does not coincide with projected increase in demand for services and populations growth.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measures 5.11-1-1 through 5.11.1-3 would mitigate impacts to the provisions of adequate law enforcement services resulting from the adoption of the UCSP to below a level of significance.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.11.1-1: Subsequent development projects shall demonstrate that significant impacts to police services resulting from an individual project are addressed prior to approval of an Urban Core Development permit or other discretionary approval. As part of project review, subsequent development projects shall be evaluated for adequate access for police vehicles (pursuant to GPU Policy PFS 6.1) and integration of Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design (CPTED) techniques (pursuant to GPU Policy PFS 6.3).</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 5.11.1-2: As a condition of project approval, individual developers shall pay the public facilities development impact fees (PFDIF) at the rate in effect at the time building permits are issued.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 5.11.1-3: As part of the annual budgeting process, the City shall assess the need for additional police personnel to provide protection services consistent with established City service levels and commensurate with the increase in population.</p>	Significant	5.11.1-1, 5.11.1-2, and 5.11.1-3	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Fire Protection.</b> The Chula Vista Fire Department does not currently meet the threshold standard for response time for the City, including the UCSP Subdistricts Area. Buildout of the proposed UCSP would increase demand for fire protection services. However, as population growth in the service area warrants, additional fire protection personnel and fire protection equipment and facilities would be provided. These provisions would help ensure adequate service within the requirements of the GMOC threshold standards. Significant impacts to fire protection services would result if timing of these provisions does not coincide with projected increase in demand for services and population growth.</p> <p>With the implementation of mitigation measures 5.11.2-1 through 5.11.2-3, significant impacts to the provision of fire protection services resulting from approval of the UCSP would be mitigated to less than significant.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.11.2-1:  Prior to approval, subsequent individual development projects in the UCSP shall demonstrate provision of adequate access and water pressure for new buildings.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 5.11.2-2:  As a condition of project approval, individual developers shall pay the public facilities development impact fees at the rate in effect at the time building permits are issued.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 5.11.2-3:  As part of the annual budgeting process, the City will assess the need for additional fire personnel to provide protection services consistent with established City service levels and commensurate with the increase in population.</p>	Significant	5.11.2-1, 5.11.2-2, and 5.11.2-3	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Schools.</b> The proposed UCSP will result in a three-fold increase in population within the Subdistricts Area at buildout and an associated increase in demand for schools. The estimated number of students to be generated by the proposed UCSP upon buildout was based on current student generation factors of the two relevant school districts. At buildout, the UCSP is expected to generate a net increase of approximately 3,877 students between elementary, middle school, and high school grades. The generation of approximately 2,485 additional elementary students would have a significant impact on existing elementary schools serving the area because they are already at or near capacity. Using every available classroom seat, the new development would require at least 59 additional elementary school classrooms. (Potentially fewer students may result from UCSP buildout or interim conditions due to the nature of the allowable development under the UCSP. New residents of the intensified urban environment of mid- to high-rise mixed uses may likely be single or potentially childless young couples, or empty nesters. Therefore, the identified impacts may be overstated. Monitoring of these trends will be necessary to accurately plan for new student enrollment.)</p> <p>The land uses proposed for the UCSP would result in a significant impact to schools unless construction of facilities coincide with student generation and associated service demands.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.11.3-1:</p> <p>Prior to approval, subsequent development projects in the UCSP shall demonstrate that significant impacts to public educational services resulting from the individual project have been addressed. As a condition of project approval, individual developers shall pay the statutory school impact fees at the rate in effect at the time building permits are issued.</p>	Significant	5.11.3-1	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Libraries.</b> Buildout of the UCSP may require additional library space in order to meet and maintain the City criteria of 500 square feet per 1,000 population and 3 books per person for new development. Based on the expected net increase in population of 18,318 with buildout of the UCSP, increased demand on existing library services would amount to approximately 9,159 square feet of library facilities and 54,954 books. Existing library service conditions in the City are inadequate and not in compliance with City standards. Additional library capacity is planned by 2007, however, with the construction of the 30,000 square foot Rancho Del Rey Library. In the absence of this or other new library construction, any additional demand on library services would comprise a significant impact.</p>	<p>The following mitigation measure will mitigate library impacts resulting from the adoption of the UCSP to below a level of significance.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 5.11.4-1:</p> <p>Prior to approval, subsequent individual development projects in the UCSP shall demonstrate that significant impacts to the provision of library services resulting from individual projects have been addressed. As a condition of project approval, individual developers shall pay the public facilities development impact fees at the rate in effect at the time building permits are issued.</p>	Significant	5.11.4-1	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Parks and Recreation.</b> Implementation of the proposed UCSP would generate increased demand for parks and recreation facilities. The Chula Vista Municipal Code, Section 17.10 (the Park Development Ordinance – PDO) applies a standard of 3 acres of parkland for every 1,000 people to all new development. A significant impact could occur if dedication of parkland and construction of new facilities does not coincide with project implementation and project population growth. Full buildout of the UCSP would be required to provide up to approximately 55 acres of new parkland. This additional parkland would be required incrementally and commensurate with new development.</p> <p>Implementation of mitigation measure 5.11.5-1 would reduce impacts to the provisions of park and recreation services and facilities resulting from the adoption of the UCSP to below a level of significance.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.11.5-1:</p> <p>Prior to approval of an Urban Core Development Permit, each subsequent project shall establish to the satisfaction of the Community Development Director that the project meets the City's parkland dedication requirement. As a condition of project approval, individual developers shall provide required parkland and facilities on-site, if possible and consistent with potential site locations identified in the UCSP and Parks Master Plan; or pay the applicable parkland acquisition and parkland development fee and recreation facility development impact fees at the rates in effect at the time building permits are issued.</p>	Significant	5.11.5-1	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation



**TABLE 1-1**  
**SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS**  
**(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>PUBLIC UTILITIES</b>				
<b>Water Supply.</b> Pursuant to State Water Code and Senate Bills 610 and 221, the Sweetwater Authority, which is the local water provider to the UCSP area, prepared a Water Supply Assessment (WSA) in June 2005 to assess the adequacy of water supply to the proposed UCSP. The WSA recalculated existing projections which did not include the proposed UCSP to arrive at a daily demand for the UCSP Subdistricts Area of 3.54 million gallons per day. Given planned improvements to local water supply facilities (expansion of the Reynolds Desalination Facility and five new deep production wells) and assurances from the CWA of the availability of water purchases, the WSA concluded and verified the supply of future water for the proposed UCSP. Since there will be adequate water supplies to serve the UCSP along with existing and future uses, no significant water supply impacts would result from adoption of the UCSP.	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant
<b>Water Treatment.</b> Significant impacts could occur as a result of the construction of capital improvement projects needed to supply treated water to the UCSP. Pursuant to Section 15145 of CEQA, analysis of the physical changes that might occur from a future water treatment construction project would be too speculative and further analysis is thus not required in this EIR. Construction of new water supply and treatment facilities would, however, be subject to independent environmental analysis pursuant to CEQA at the time the new facility is planned for construction.	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>PUBLIC UTILITIES (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Wastewater Treatment Capacity.</b> Chula Vista owns capacity in the Metro system, which provides conveyance of City wastewater flows. Increasing population will place additional demand on sewer services. While it is the intent of the City to ensure that services are provided concurrent with need, the provision of sewer services is not solely within its authority. Although the City is in the process of acquiring additional capacity from Metro, that acquisition has not yet been finalized. Based on GPU buildout projections, the City will be generating approximately 26.2 mgd of wastewater citywide by 2030 and would need to acquire additional 6.4 mgd of capacity rights by the year 2030 in order to meet citywide projected demand. Of this total, 1.57 mgd are projected to be generated in western Chula Vista, including a projected generation of 0.88 mgd for the UCSP Subdistricts Area. Therefore, impacts to the provision of sewer service are considered significant.</p>	<p>Development projects within the UCSP Subdistricts Area would require the approval of an Urban Core Development Permit established through the Design Review Process which would include the following mitigation measure to reduce wastewater impacts to below a level of significance:</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 5.12.2-1:</p> <p>Prior to the approval of subsequent individual development projects, project plans shall demonstrate that there is sufficient wastewater capacity available to serve the proposed project. Conditions of approval may require sewer capacity fees to be contributed to mitigate project-related impacts.</p>	Significant	5.12.2-1	Not Significant
<p><b>Solid Waste.</b> The UCSP area is served by the Otay Landfill. Using the average rate of daily disposal and assuming the additional population of 18, 318 at buildout of the UCSP Subdistricts Area, and no additional recycling programs are implemented, the Otay Landfill has sufficient capacity to serve the UCSP for approximately 25 years, the horizon of the proposed UCSP. Since there is sufficient capacity to accommodate projected population at buildout of the UCSP, there is no significant impact to integrated waste management services.</p>	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>PUBLIC UTILITIES (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Energy.</b> Impacts to energy are considered significant because there is no long-term assurance that energy supplies will be available at buildout of the UCSP. Avoidance of energy impacts cannot be assured regardless of land use designation or population size. Although changes to planned land uses in the City would continue to implement the Energy Strategy Action Plan, San Diego Regional Energy Plan and Transit First Plan, implementation of the proposed land uses identified in the UCSP has the potential to result in significant impacts to nonrenewable and slowly renewable energy resources as a result of anticipated growth.</p> <p>The environmental sustainability measures of the UCSP(Chapter VI, G.) may further serve to reduce energy consumption associated with construction and occupation of structures within the UCSP area.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.12.4-1:</p> <p>The City shall continue to implement the Energy Strategy Action Plan that addresses demand side management, energy efficient and renewable energy outreach programs for businesses and residents, energy acquisition, power generation, and distributed energy resources and legislative actions, and continue to implement the CO<sub>2</sub> Reduction Plan to lessen the impacts on energy.</p> <p>While implementation of the above mitigation measure reduces energy related impacts, because there is no assurance that energy resources will be available to adequately serve the projected increase in population resulting from adoption of the UCSP, the impact remains significant.</p>	Significant	5.12.4-1	Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>HAZARDS/RISK OF UPSET</b>				
<p><b><i>Hazardous Materials Transport, Use Disposal or Release.</i></b> Hazardous materials occur within the UCSP area and pose significant public health and safety risks during construction or long-term occupation of proposed development. Exposure to hazardous materials that exceed state and/or federal standards can occur through contact with contaminated soil or groundwater, through ingestion, skin contact or the inhalation of vapors or dust.</p> <p>An approximate total of 103 sites of potential hazardous concern have been identified from various federal, state and local databases as occurring within the Subdistricts Area. In addition, due to the presence of numerous pre-1960s structures in the area, there is a potential that during construction or demolition, workers may come into contact with hazardous building materials( asbestos and lead).</p> <p>Future development consistent with the proposed UCSP would result in significant impacts if such development allows greater contact between humans and hazards.</p>	<p>Mitigation Measure 5.13-1:  Prior to approval of subsequent individual development projects, any project plans that propose land uses which use, transport, store, and dispose of hazardous materials shall be conducted in compliance with the relevant regulations of federal, state, and local agencies, including the EPA, California Department of Health Services (DHS), and California Department of Transportation.</p> <p>Mitigation Measure 5.13-2:  A risk assessment shall be performed at all sites within the study area where contamination has been identified or is discovered during future construction activities, and at which soil is to be disturbed, to address risks posed by any residual contamination, and to establish appropriate mitigation measures (e.g., natural attenuation, active remediation, engineering controls) that would be protective of human health and the environment. All assessment and remediation activities shall be conducted in accordance with a Work Plan that is approved by the regulatory agency having oversight of the activities.</p>	Significant	5.13-1 and 5.13-2	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>HAZARDS/RISK OF UPSET (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Hazardous Emitters.</b> Due to the nature of historic and current land uses located throughout the UCSP area, there is a high potential for encountering hazardous materials sites identified on registers compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5. However, significant impacts to human health and the environment would be avoided through compliance with mandatory federal, state, and local regulations.</p> <p>State law requires the mapping of “general areas” within which hazardous facilities might be established. The GPU limited the location of potential emitters to general areas that coincide with industrial land use designations in order to avoid placement of potential emitters of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials or substances in close proximity to sensitive receivers.</p> <p>The proposed UCSP does not contain any designated industrial lands nor any mapped general areas. Therefore, impacts are not significant.</p>	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-1  
SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS RESULTS  
(continued)**

Impact	Mitigation	Proposed UCSP		
		SBM	MM	SAM
<b>HAZARDS/RISK OF UPSET (cont.)</b>				
<p><b>Emergency Response.</b> There are no land uses proposed for the UCSP that would interfere with or impair implementation of an adopted emergency response or evacuation plan. In addition, the land uses identified in the proposed UCSP would not physically interfere with any known adopted emergency plans.</p> <p>As redevelopment proceeds in the UCSP Subdistricts Area, urbanization would intensify. As intensification increases, the potential for impacts of man-made or natural disaster could also increase. The ongoing implementation and updating of the DEH Emergency Response Management Program and Chula Vista Fire Code would assure adequate response to unforeseeable emergencies within the UCSP. Therefore, impacts to adopted emergency response or evacuation plans are self-mitigating and not significant.</p>	No mitigation required.	Not Significant	None Required	Not Significant

SBM = Significance before Mitigation

MM = Mitigation Measures

SAM = Significance after Mitigation

**TABLE 1-2  
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<b>LAND USE</b>		
Impacts to land use resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be greater than those identified for the proposed UCSP because of inconsistency of existing Municipal Code Zoning with the adopted GPU. The current zoning conforms to the former General Plan, rather than the plan established by the currently adopted GPU. California law requires zoning ordinances to be consistent with the adopted GPU. Therefore, the No Project Alternative would result in the zoning for the Subdistricts Area of the UCSP being inconsistent with the GPU. This comprises a significant impact because the No Project Alternative conflicts with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project, which is a CEQA significance criterion.	Impacts to land use resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed UCSP. The Reduced Project Alternative would implement the same zoning as the proposed UCSP, both of which conform to the adopted GPU as mandated by State Law. The proposed UCSP proposes changes in zoning to increase density and to allow for a greater degree of mixed-use development in key locations promoting pedestrian and transit oriented development. As identified in the Land Use Section 5.1 of this EIR and summarized in Table 1-1, future development's compliance with the UCSP's Land Use and Development Regulations and Development Design Guidelines, which are consistent with the adopted GPU, would ensure that no significant land use adjacency/community character and planning conformance impacts would result from implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative.	Effects to land use resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. The Automobile Priority Alternative would implement the same zoning as the proposed UCSP. The zoning conforms to the adopted General Plan. Because the Automobile Priority Alternative would result in the same land use regulations as the proposed project, it would not result in the UCSP area being out of compliance with the GPU. Therefore, it would not conflict with an applicable land use plan, policy, or regulation of an agency with jurisdiction over the project.  Future development's compliance with the UCSP's Land Use and Development Regulations and Development Design Guidelines, which are consistent with the adopted GPU, would ensure that no significant land use adjacency/community character and planning conformance impacts would result from implementation of the Automobile Priority Alternative.

**TABLE 1-2**  
**COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**  
**(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<b>LANDFORM ALTERATION/AESTHETICS</b>		
Impacts to aesthetics and visual character resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP because of the lower densities, buildings heights and mass allowed with this alternative. Under the No Project Alternative, the visual character of the UCSP area pursuant to existing zoning would be similar to what exists today, and would represent a less intensified urban environment, with generally shorter building heights and less structural mass and density than the proposed UCSP. The No Project Alternative also differs substantially from the proposed UCSP in that it allows the continuance of single-use (instead of mixed-use) zoned parcels which would permit less residential development in the Subdistricts Area as a whole, by restricting residential uses to areas outlying the single-use commercially zoned corridors. The No Project Alternative could result in continued visual quality impacts associated with the growth permitted under the existing zoning in the absence of design guidelines for enhanced gateways, and other urban amenities as envisioned by the GPU and proposed by the UCSP.	Impacts to landform and aesthetics resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. Adoption of the proposed UCSP would result in substantial changes to visual quality throughout the UCSP area through increased density, increased number of buildings and greater building heights and mass. By reducing the overall use of the area by 25 percent, these effects would be lessened in the Reduced Project Alternative. The development standards and design guidelines which outline allowable and recommended parameters for the development of the Subdistricts Area that are proposed as part of the proposed UCSP would also occur under this alternative. Compliance with these standards and guidelines ensure that development within the UCSP area would not result in architecture, urban design, landscaping, or landforms that negatively detract from the prevailing aesthetic character of the site or surrounding area. Because subsequent project specifics are not known, the extent to which they will conform to the UCSP development regulations and design guidelines cannot be determined. Without assurance of conformance with the UCSP, this impact will remain significant under the Reduced Project Alternative (and the proposed	Effects to visual character of the UCSP area resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. Adoption of this alternative or the proposed UCSP would equally result in substantial intensification of existing land use and changes to visual quality throughout the UCSP area. Increased density, building heights and mass would accommodate the projected three-fold population increase for the UCSP Subdistricts Area. The existing visual character of low-rise single-use commercial and residential blocks of the UCSP would change to a mix of primarily low rise and mid-rise, with some high-rise, mixed-uses where commercial, office, and high-density residential uses would be integrated within the same structure or block. The development standards and design guidelines which outline allowable and recommended parameters for the development of the Subdistricts Area that are proposed as part of the UCSP would also occur under this alternative. Conditions of approval would be required on a project by project basis to ensure development is consistent with the UCSP development standards and design guidelines as provided in mitigation measures 5.2.5-1 and 5.2.5-2.



**TABLE 1-2  
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES  
(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<b>LANDFORM ALTERATION/AESTHETICS (cont.)</b>		
	project). Therefore, conditions of approval would be required on a project by project basis to ensure development consistency with the UCSP as provided in mitigation measures 5.2.5-1 and 5.2.5-2.	
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES</b>		
Impacts to cultural resources resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be roughly equivalent to those identified for the proposed UCSP as both allow development over roughly the same geographic area. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the No Project Alternative would result in potentially significant cultural resources impacts. The UCSP area contains several known and designated historic architectural resources (sites and structures). In addition, the UCSP area potentially contains additional as yet unidentified historically significant resources. Demolition or substantial alteration of these historically significant architectural resources as a result of future development or redevelopment of the area (as allowed by existing underlying Redevelopment Plans and existing zoning) would comprise a significant cultural resources impact. In addition, although unlikely, future construction activities involving grading to depths equal to or greater than six feet may impact significant archaeological resources.	Impacts to cultural resources resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed UCSP. As noted in Section 5.3.4 of this EIR, 11 buildings or sites within the UCSP Subdistricts Area are currently designated or eligible to be designated as historically significant. Demolition or substantial alteration of these buildings as a result of future development in accordance with the proposed UCSP would comprise a significant cultural resources impact. The Reduced Project Alternative does not change this potential. As with the proposed UCSP, the loss or substantial alteration of as-yet unknown historically significant architectural resources or prehistoric and historic archaeological resources due to development of the Reduced Project Alternative would comprise a significant cultural resources impact.  Mitigation measures 5.3.5-1 through 5.3.5-5 detailed in	The Automobile Priority Alternative does not change the potential for impacts to cultural resources. Effects to cultural resources resulting from implementation of the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, the loss or substantial alteration of 11 identified historically significant architectural sites and as-yet unknown historically significant architectural resources or prehistoric and historic archaeological resources would comprise a significant cultural resources impact.  Mitigation measures 5.3.5-1 through 5.3.5-5 (included in Table 1-1) would be required to mitigate impacts from the implementation of the Automobile Priority Alternative. If on a project-specific basis, these actions are demonstrated to be infeasible and a historically significant architectural resource would be demolished, documentation of the resource per HABS Level I may not be sufficient to reduce impacts to below a level of significance.

**TABLE 1-2  
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES  
(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<b>CULTURAL RESOURCES (cont.)</b>		
Significant cultural resource impacts resulting from future development and redevelopment in accord with the No Project Alternative would be reduced below a level of significance through pre-construction monitoring, implementation of a construction mitigation program, and, for architectural resources, preservation, rehabilitation, relocation or historical documentation prior to demolition according to local, state, and federal standards.	Section 5.3.5 of this EIR and included in Table 1-1 would be required to mitigate these impacts from the implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative. Preservation, adaptive reuse, rehabilitation, or relocation of a listed/eligible historic resource consistent with the Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines would reduce impacts to said historical structures to below a level of significance. If on a project-specific basis, these actions are demonstrated to be infeasible and the resource would be demolished documentation, of the resource per HABS Level I may not be sufficient to reduce impacts to below a level of significance. In that case, impacts to architectural resources may be significant and unmitigated.	In that case, impacts to architectural resources may be significant and unmitigated.
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS</b>		
Impacts to geology and soils resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative are roughly equivalent to those identified for the proposed UCSP as both allow development over roughly the same area. As with the UCSP, implementation of the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts related to geology and soils. Future development would be exposed to geological hazards associated with seismic events, liquefaction, and expansive soils. Potential impacts resulting from geologic hazards would be reduced below a level	Geology and soils impacts resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be equivalent to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts related to geology and soils. Future development would be exposed to geological hazards associated with seismic events, liquefaction, and expansive soils. Potential impacts resulting from geologic hazards would be reduced below a level of significance through project-specific design measures, including compliance	Impacts to geology and soils resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the Automobile Priority Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts related to geology and soils. Future development would be exposed to geological hazards associated with seismic events, liquefaction, and expansive soils. Potential impacts resulting from geologic hazards would be reduced below a level of significance through project-specific design measures,

**TABLE 1-2  
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES  
(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<b>GEOLOGY AND SOILS (cont.)</b>		
of significance through project-specific design measures, including compliance with applicable building codes (e.g., Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, and the UBC). Additionally, a comprehensive, site-specific soil and geologic evaluation would be conducted for all future development projects to determine potential hazards and site conditions.	with applicable building codes (e.g., Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, and the UBC). Additionally, a comprehensive, site-specific soil and geologic evaluation shall be conducted for all future projects to determine potential hazards and site conditions (see mitigation measures 5.4.5-1 and 5.4.5-2 included in Table 1-1). The proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative both forecast development over the same area. As such, both the proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative have an equivalent potential for impacting geological resources.	including compliance with applicable building codes (e.g., Title 24 of the California Code of Regulations, and the UBC). Additionally, a comprehensive, site-specific soil and geologic evaluation shall be conducted for all future projects to determine potential hazards and site conditions (see mitigation measures 5.4.5-1 and 5.4.5-2 included in Table 1-1). The proposed UCSP and the Automobile Priority Alternative both forecast development over the same area. As such, both the proposed plan and the Automobile Priority Alternative have an equivalent potential for impacting geological resources.
<b>PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES</b>		
Potentially significant paleontological resources impacts would result from implementation of the No Project Alternative and would be roughly equivalent to those identified for the proposed UCSP, because both allow development over the same geographic area. The UCSP area contains a large expanse of moderate paleontological resource sensitivity. Exposure or disturbance of soils greater than 5 feet in depth and at volumes in excess of 2000 cubic yards would require	As with the proposed UCSP, the Reduced Project Alternative would result in potentially significant paleontological resources impacts during exposure or disturbance of soils greater than 5 feet in depth and at volumes in excess of 2000 cubic yards. The potential to encounter paleontological resources does not change with the Reduced Project Alternative compared to the proposed UCSP. Effects to paleontological resources resulting from this alternative or the proposed UCSP	The Automobile Priority Alternative does not change the potential for impacts to paleontological resources compared to the proposed UCSP. Effects to paleontological resources resulting from this alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. For both the proposed UCSP and Automobile Priority Alternative, exposure or disturbance of soils greater than 5 feet in depth and at volumes in excess of 2000 cubic yards would require mitigation.

**TABLE 1-2  
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES  
(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<b>PALEONTOLOGICAL RESOURCES (cont.)</b>		
<p>mitigation. These grading thresholds are likely to be exceeded under the No Project Alternative as existing buildings are replaced or redeveloped over time in accordance with underlying Redevelopment Plans and existing zoning. This comprises a significant paleontological impact.</p> <p>Potential paleontological resource impacts resulting from this alternative would be reduced below a level of significance through pre-construction monitoring and implementation of a construction mitigation program.</p>	<p>would be identical. For both the Reduced Project Alternative and proposed UCSP, potentially significant paleontological impacts would be mitigated through pre-construction monitoring and implementation of a construction mitigation program as identified in mitigation measure 5.5-1 as identified in Table 1-1 and Section 5.5 of this EIR.</p>	<p>Mitigation measure 5.5-1 identified in Section 5.5 of this EIR and summarized in Table 1-1 would be required to mitigate potentially significant paleontological impacts associated with implementation of the Automobile Priority Alternative. This mitigation measure includes pre-construction monitoring and implementation of a construction mitigation program on a project-specific basis.</p>
<b>WATER RESOURCES/WATER QUALITY</b>		
<p>Impacts to hydrology and water quality resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts related to water resources and quality. Future development within the Subdistricts Area would increase runoff by increasing the impermeable surface area. Future development that intensifies land use over existing conditions, would increase direct runoff to drainage basins, municipal storm water systems, and ultimately to receiving surface and ground water bodies. This runoff will likely contain typical urban runoff pollutants such as sediment, pathogens, heavy metals, petroleum products, nutrients, and trash.</p>	<p>Impacts to hydrology and water quality resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be roughly the same as those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts related to water resources and water quality. Future development would increase runoff by increasing the impermeable surface area. The proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative both forecast development over roughly the same area. As such, both the proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative have roughly equivalent potential for impacting water quality. Significant impacts to water quality resulting from future development would be mitigated through compliance with all applicable federal, state and</p>	<p>Hydrology and water quality effects resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the Automobile Priority Alternative has the potential to result in significant impacts related to water resources and water quality. Future development would increase runoff by increasing the impermeable surface area in the City. Adherence to water quality control measures required under the San Diego County Municipal Permit would avoid potential water quality impacts. The proposed UCSP and the Automobile Priority Alternative both forecast development over the same area. As such, both the proposed plan and the Automobile Priority Alternative have an equivalent potential for impacting water quality.</p>

**TABLE 1-2  
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES  
(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<b>WATER RESOURCES/WATER QUALITY (cont.)</b>		
	local laws and regulations regarding water quality (e.g., JURMP, SUSMP, NPDES, SWPP, and City Development and Redevelopment Projects Storm Water Manual) as identified in measures 5.7-1 through 5.7-4 as shown in Table 1-1.	
<b>TRANSPORTATION</b>		
<p>Impacts to transportation resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant traffic and circulation impacts. Future development within the Subdistricts Area in accordance with existing zoning would potentially allow additional commercial uses, some residential development and would not provide for the benefits of mixed use and compact development which concentrates development at transit stations, and reduces long commute trips.</p> <p>Currently, all existing roadway segments and all except three existing intersections within the UCSP area operate at acceptable levels of service.</p>	<p>Impacts to transportation resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would potentially be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant traffic and circulation impacts. Future development within the Subdistricts Area in accordance with the proposed UCSP would result in two roadway segments and 19 intersections dropping below acceptable levels of service. While not quantifiable given lack of available data, it can be assumed that the Reduced Project Alternative, which comprises a 25 percent reduction of the proposed UCSP, would also result in several roadway segments and intersections dropping below acceptable levels of service. As such, both the UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative would result in significant traffic impacts; however, the Reduced Project Alternative would likely have</p>	<p>Transportation impacts resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. The Automobile Priority Alternative would mitigate impacts to the roadway segment of Third Avenue between E and G Streets and the following three intersections by resulting in improvements that would allow them to operate at LOS D or better.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Broadway/H Street</li> <li>• Hilltop Drive/H Street</li> <li>• Third Avenue/J Street</li> </ul> <p>With inclusion of the improvements identified for this alternative, there would be no significant impacts to UCSP intersections. All mitigation measures identified for the proposed UCSP would be required in conjunction with the Automobile Priority Alternative.</p>

**TABLE 1-2  
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES  
(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<b>TRANSPORTATION (cont.)</b>		
<p>The potential increase in residential and commercial population of the UCSP area, as allowed by existing zoning, would likely result in several roadway segments and intersections decreasing in levels of service. As such, both the UCSP and the No Project Alternative would result in significant traffic impacts; however, the No Project Alternative would likely have less of an impact in terms of number of roadways and intersections affected.</p> <p>In regard to future demands for public transit services, a similar conclusion can be drawn. While both the proposed UCSP and the No Project Alternative would allow future development that would place greater demand on local and regional transit services, the lesser number of allowable residential units and commercial square footage resulting from existing zoning would create less of a future impact on area roadways and intersections and less of a demand on public transit services. In either case, significant impacts to transportation would require mitigation in the form of roadway and intersection improvements.</p>	<p>less of an impact in terms of number of roadways and intersection affected.</p> <p>In regard to future demands for public transit services, a similar conclusion can be drawn. While both the proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative would allow future development that would place greater demand on local and regional transit services, the lesser number of allowable residential units and commercial. Square footage resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would create less of a future impact on area roadways and intersections and less of a demand on public transit services. In either case, significant impacts to transportation would require mitigation in the form of roadway and intersection improvements</p>	<p>Additional traffic improvements to mitigate decline in the LOS for these intersections and street segment was not included in the proposed UCSP because of conflicts with plan objectives and right-of-way constraints. In order to fully mitigate traffic impacts within the Subdistricts Area, the UCSP would have had to implement traffic mitigation measures that conflict with the plan's objectives to enhance pedestrian movement. The acquisition of additional of right-of-way was not considered feasible due to the existing built condition at the affected intersections.</p>

**TABLE 1-2  
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES  
(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<p><b>AIR QUALITY</b></p> <p>Air quality emissions resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be potentially greater than those identified for the proposed UCSP. As identified in the GPU EIR, a comparative assessment of the anticipated air emissions resulting from Year 2030 buildout of the former General Plan (which the existing Municipal Code Zoning implements) and the recently adopted GPU concluded that with the exception of reactive organic gases, the emissions resulting from the adopted GPU, including NO<sub>x</sub> compounds, are anticipated to be less than those that would occur under the former General Plan. In addition, the former General Plan shows an increase in PM<sub>10</sub> and SO<sub>x</sub> relative to the existing condition.</p> <p>Air quality impacts resulting from inconsistency with the SDAB RAQS would be less with implementation of the No Project Alternative than with implementation of the proposed UCSP.</p>	<p>Air quality Impacts resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. The results of a GPU EIR comparative assessment of anticipated air emissions resulting from buildout of the GPU and various alternative scenarios, including a Reduced Project Alternative, concluded that with the exception of reactive organic gases, the emissions resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be less than those that would occur under the proposed UCSP.</p> <p>However, because the region is not in attainment for ozone and PM<sub>2.5</sub> and is unclassifiable for PM<sub>10</sub>, there is the potential for future projects that would conform to the Reduced Project Alternative to contribute to cumulatively considerable emissions should multiple projects be implemented simultaneously. Cumulatively significant impacts associated with sensitive receptors adjacent to the Interstate 5 Freeway would also occur under this</p>	<p>Air quality impacts resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. Because there is a reasonable potential for multiple projects occurring at the same time, construction impacts are significant under both the Automobile Priority Alternative and proposed UCSP. Furthermore, because the Automobile Priority Alternative and the proposed UCSP are not consistent with the growth assumptions of the RAQS, implementation of this alternative would not comply with the SANDAG TCM Plan and, therefore, would result in significant air quality impacts. Cumulatively significant impacts associated with sensitive receptors adjacent to the Interstate 5 Freeway would also remain under this alternative. As with the proposed UCSP, mitigation for mobile source reductions of diesel particulates is the responsibility of state and federal agencies, therefore the impact would be significant and unmitigated.</p>

**TABLE 1-2  
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES  
(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<b>AIR QUALITY (cont.)</b>		
<p>Because the No Project Alternative is consistent with the growth assumptions of the RAQS, implementation of the No Project Alternative would comply with the SANDAG TCM Plan and, therefore, would not result in significant air quality impacts. The proposed UCSP and the GPU is not in compliance with the SANDAG TCM Plan and as such is considered a significant impact. The No Project Alternative conforms to the program and does not represent a significant air plan impact.</p>	<p>alternative (and the proposed UCSP). However, given that the Reduced Project Alternative comprises a 25 percent reduction of the proposed UCSP and by extension 25 percent fewer units, the air quality impacts to the Reduced Project Alternative would be potentially less than those incurred under the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, mitigation for mobile source reductions of diesel particulates is the responsibility of state and federal agencies, therefore the impact would be significant and unmitigated.</p> <p>Because the Reduced Project Alternative is consistent with the adopted GPU and not the former General Plan, which formed the basis of the growth assumptions of the RAQS, implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative would not comply with the SANDAG TCM Plan and, therefore, would result in significant air quality impacts.</p>	



**TABLE 1-2**  
**COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**  
**(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<b>NOISE</b>		
Noise impacts resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, development of the No Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant noise impacts. Development under the No Project Alternative, as with the proposed UCSP, would result in an increase in allowable density along highways and major arterials and adjacent to rail, thereby exposing potentially sensitive receptors (residential and park users) to noise levels in excess of applicable thresholds. However, given that the No Project Alternative allows less of an increase in allowable development compared to the three-fold increase allowed under the proposed UCSP, the noise impacts resulting from the No Project Alternative would be less than those incurred under the proposed UCSP. The proposed UCSP also allows a greater number of sensitive receptors to be placed adjacent to the San Diego Trolley line and Interstate 5, through increased density and building heights in these areas over existing zoning.	Noise impacts resulting from implementation of the Reduced Project Alternative would potentially be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, development of the Reduced Project Alternative has the potential to result in significant noise impacts. Development under the Reduced Project Alternative, as with the proposed UCSP, would result in an increase in allowable density along highways and major arterials and adjacent to rail, thereby exposing potentially sensitive receptors (residential and park users) to noise levels in excess of applicable thresholds. However, given that the Reduced Project Alternative comprises a 25 percent reduction of the proposed UCSP and by extension 25 percent fewer residents, the noise impacts resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be potentially less than those incurred under the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, all future projects allowed in the Reduced Project Alternative with the potential to be exposed to noise in excess of the specified limits shall be required to complete applicable exterior and interior noise analyses and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City Planning and Building Director, Community	Noise effects resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, development of the Automobile Priority Alternative has the potential to result in significant noise impacts. Development under the Automobile Priority Alternative would result in an increase in allowable density along highways and major arterials, and adjacent to rail. All future projects with the potential to be exposed to noise in excess of the specified limits would be required to complete applicable exterior and interior noise analyses and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City Planning and Building Director, Community Development Director, or Building Official, that project-specific design includes measures to reduce any noise impacts to below a level of significance.

**TABLE 1-2  
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES  
(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<b>NOISE (cont.)</b>		
As with the proposed UCSP, all future projects with the potential to be exposed to noise in excess of specified limits would be required to complete applicable exterior and interior noise analyses and demonstrate to the satisfaction of the City Planning and Building Director, Community Development Director, or Building Official, that project-specific design includes measures to reduce any noise impacts to below a level of significance.	Development Director, or Building Official, that project-specific design includes measures to reduce any noise impacts to below a level of significance.	
<b>PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES</b>		
Impacts to public services and utilities resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. The No Project Alternative would allow an increase in the residential and commercial population of the UCSP Subdistricts Area. This increase in population and land use intensity would result in an associated increase in demands for law enforcement, fire protection, educational services, libraries, and parks, as well as increased demands on supply and distribution	Impacts to public services and utilities resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be less than those identified for the proposed UCSP. The Reduced Project Alternative represents a decrease in potential population relative to the proposed UCSP, thus reducing the demand for services and utilities. While the Reduced Project Alternative would reduce the demand for public services and utilities resources compared to the proposed UCSP, the same approach to upgrading facilities would need to be implemented.	Implementation of the Automobile Priority Alternative would result in significant demands for public services and utilities identical to those identified for in the proposed UCSP. The Automobile Priority Alternative does not change the projected population relative to the proposed UCSP. As such, it does not reduce the demand for services and utilities.

**TABLE 1-2  
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES  
(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<p><b>PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES (cont.)</b></p> <p>of potable water, wastewater, solid waste and energy utilities. Impacts to the provision of these public services and utilities would be significant if provision of additional facilities, personnel or other resources does not coincide with the anticipated population growth and increased demand for these services and utilities. The No Project Alternative represents a decrease in potential population relative to the proposed UCSP, thus reducing the future demand for services and utilities.</p> <p>The City of Chula Vista currently implements a public facilities development impact fee program that requires all new development within the City to contribute their fair share to the funding and construction of needed public infrastructure improvements. In addition, the City imposes various other levies (recreational facilities development impact fees, statutory school impacts fees) and programs (Growth Management Ordinance, Capital Improvement Program) that annually review, reprioritize and schedule needed citywide public infrastructure. Subsequent projects developed under the No Project Alternative (or the proposed UCSP) will be subject to the payment of applicable development impact fees at the rate in effect at the time building permits are issued in order to mitigate significant impacts to public services and utilities.</p>	<p>The City of Chula Vista currently implements a public facilities development impact fee program that requires all new development within the City to contribute their fair share to the funding and construction of needed public infrastructure improvements. In addition, the City imposes various other levies (recreational facilities development impact fees, statutory school impacts fees) and programs (Growth Management Ordinance, Capital Improvement Program) that annually review, reprioritize and schedule needed citywide public infrastructure. In addition, the proposed UCSP and Reduced Project Alternative include a Facilities Implementation Analysis that evaluates ongoing, long-term improvement projects and determines whether long-term projects revenues are sufficiently aligned with long-term potential costs of public infrastructure. Subsequent projects developed under the Reduced Project Alternative (or the proposed UCSP) would be subject to the payment of applicable development impact fees at the rate in effect at the time building permits are issued in order to mitigate significant impacts to public services and utilities.</p>	<p>The Automobile Priority Alternative would implement the same approach to upgrading facilities as identified in the proposed UCSP. Subsequent individual projects developed under the Automobile Priority Alternative (or the proposed UCSP) would be subject to the payment of applicable development impact fees at the rate in effect at the time building permits are issued in order to mitigate significant impacts to public services and utilities, as outlined in mitigation measures 5.11.1-1, 5.11.1-2, 5.11.1-3, 5.11.2-1, 5.11.2-2, 5.11.2-3, 5.11.3-1, 5.11.4-1, 5.11.5-1, 5.12.2-1, and 5.12.4-1 as described in Table 1-1.</p>

**TABLE 1-2**  
**COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES**  
**(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING</b>		
<p>Population and housing impacts resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be equivalent to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, development of the No Project Alternative would not result in significant population and housing impacts. The No Project Alternative (and the proposed UCSP) would induce population growth and allow new development and redevelopment to accommodate growth that is already planned to occur locally. Development in accordance with the existing zoning of the No Project Alternative would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people necessitating the construction or replacement of housing elsewhere. Housing that may be removed by future individual projects (due to construction/redevelopment) would not necessitate the construction of housing elsewhere because the overall number of housing units allowed by the Project would be sufficient within the UCSP area to accommodate the affected population.</p>	<p>Impacts to population and housing resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, development of the Reduced Project Alternative would not result in significant population and housing impacts. While the Reduced Project Alternative would also induce substantial population growth it would allow new development and redevelopment that would accommodate growth that is already planned to occur locally. Development in accordance with the Reduced Project Alternative would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people necessitating the construction or replacement of housing elsewhere. Housing that may be removed by future individual projects would not necessitate the construction of housing elsewhere because the overall number of housing units allowed by the Reduced Project Alternative would be sufficient within the UCSP area to accommodate the affected population. The proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative both forecast development over roughly the same area. As such, both the</p>	<p>Impacts to population and housing resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. As with the proposed UCSP, development of the Automobile Priority Alternative would not result in significant population and housing impacts. While the Automobile Priority Alternative and the proposed UCSP would induce substantial population growth they would allow new development and redevelopment that would accommodate growth that is already planned to occur locally. Development in accordance with the Automobile Priority Alternative and the proposed UCSP would not displace substantial numbers of existing housing or people necessitating the construction or replacement of housing elsewhere. Housing that may be removed by future individual projects would not necessitate the construction of housing elsewhere because the overall number of housing units allowed by the proposed UCSP and Automobile Priority Alternative would be sufficient within the UCSP area to accommodate the affected population. Both the UCSP and the Automobile Priority Alternative have an equivalent potential for affecting population and housing, with both scenarios resulting in effects considered to be not significant.</p>

**TABLE 1-2  
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES  
(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<b>POPULATION AND HOUSING (cont.)</b>		
<p>The proposed UCSP and the No Project Alternative both allow development over the same geographic area. As such, both the UCSP and the No Project Alternative have an equivalent potential for affecting population and housing, with both scenarios resulting in effects considered to be not significant. The proposed UCSP, however, would provide greater opportunity for new housing that would be more responsive to the regional housing needs as projected by SANDAG and the State Department of Housing and Community Development.</p>	<p>proposed UCSP and the Reduced Project Alternative have a roughly equivalent potential for affecting population and housing, with both scenarios resulting in effects considered to be not significant.</p>	
<b>HAZARDS/RISK OF UPSET</b>		
<p>Hazardous materials impacts resulting from implementation of the No Project Alternative would be the same as those identified for the proposed UCSP. The UCSP area contains numerous known and listed hazardous sites of potential environmental concern. Approximately 103 sites of potential environmental concern were identified in the UCSP Subdistricts Area through recent database research. In addition, the UCSP Subdistricts Area contains several older buildings that may contain hazardous building materials (lead, asbestos, PCBs) that could be exposed during demolition or renovation. Future</p>	<p>Hazardous materials impacts resulting from the Reduced Project Alternative would be roughly identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. The UCSP area contains numerous known and listed hazardous sites of potential environmental concern. Approximately 103 sites of potential environmental concern were identified in the UCSP Subdistricts Area through recent database research. In addition, the UCSP Subdistricts Area contains several older buildings that may contain hazardous building materials (lead, asbestos, PCBs) that could be exposed during demolition or renovation. The proposed UCSP and the Reduced</p>	<p>Effects from hazardous materials resulting from the Automobile Priority Alternative would be identical to those identified for the proposed UCSP. The UCSP area contains numerous known and listed hazardous sites of potential environmental concern. Approximately 103 sites of potential environmental concern were identified in the UCSP Subdistricts Area through recent database research. In addition, the UCSP Subdistricts Area contains several older buildings that may contain hazardous building materials (lead, asbestos, PCBs) that could be exposed during demolition or renovation. Future development consistent with the Automobile</p>

**TABLE 1-2  
COMPARISON OF PROJECT ALTERNATIVES  
(continued)**

No Project Alternative	Reduced Project Alternative	Automobile Priority Alternative
<b>HAZARDS/RISK OF UPSET (cont.)</b>		
development consistent with the No Project Alternative, as with the proposed UCSP, may result in significant impacts if such development allows greater contact between humans and hazards. In either case, significant hazardous materials impacts would be similarly mitigated through compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations regarding hazardous materials siting, assessment and remediation. In addition, a risk assessment would be required at all sites within the UCSP area where contamination has been identified or is discovered during future construction activities; and a hazardous building materials survey would be conducted at all buildings in the UCSP area prior to demolition or renovation activities.	<p>Project Alternative both forecast development over roughly the same area. As such, both the proposed plan and the Reduced Project Alternative have an equivalent potential for encountering hazardous materials.</p> <p>Future development consistent with the Reduced Project Alternative, as with the proposed UCSP, may result in significant impacts if such development allows greater contact between humans and hazards. In either case, significant hazardous materials impacts would be similarly mitigated through compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations regarding hazardous materials siting, assessment and remediation (see mitigation measures 5.13-1 and 5.13-2 in Table 1-1). In addition, a risk assessment would be required at all sites within the UCSP area where contamination has been identified or is discovered during future construction activities; and a hazardous building materials survey would be conducted at all buildings in the UCSP area prior to demolition or renovation activities.</p>	Priority Alternative, as with the proposed UCSP, may result in significant impacts if such development allows greater contact between humans and hazards. In either case, significant hazardous materials impacts would be similarly mitigated through compliance with all applicable federal, state and local laws and regulations regarding hazardous materials siting, assessment and remediation. In addition, a risk assessment would be required at all sites within the UCSP area where contamination has been identified or is discovered during future construction activities; and a hazardous building materials survey would be conducted at all buildings in the UCSP area prior to demolition or renovation activities (see mitigation measures 5.13-1 and 5.13-2 in Table 1-1).

## 2.0 Introduction

This Program Environmental Impact Report (EIR) for the proposed City of Chula Vista Urban Core Specific Plan (UCSP) has been prepared in compliance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) and Guidelines (Public Resources Code Section 21000, et seq. and California Code of Regulations, Title 14, Section 15000, et seq.). The purpose of this Program EIR is to address the potential environmental effects of, and provide CEQA documentation for, the implementation of the UCSP that proposes to govern new development and redevelopment of the Chula Vista urban core. This document is intended to be used by the City of Chula Vista, as Lead Agency, in approving the proposed UCSP. In addition, as a Program EIR, the document is intended to be used by the City of Chula Vista as well as the Chula Vista Redevelopment Corporation and other Responsible Agencies, when taking action on subsequent permits to allow development within the UCSP area in accordance with the proposed UCSP.

### 2.1 Proposed Project

The UCSP has been prepared as a neighborhood level planning document which provides updated zoning regulations, development standards, and design guidelines in order to implement the planned land uses envisioned in the City's General Plan Update (GPU) for the traditional downtown area of Chula Vista. In addition to being a land use regulatory document, the UCSP also outlines the framework for the provision of urban amenities and other public improvements associated with anticipated development pursuant to the UCSP. The planning horizon for the UCSP projects through the year 2030, with provisions for periodic evaluation of progress in meeting plan goals.

Maps contained in the UCSP (and replicated in this EIR) show the boundaries of a 1700-acre Study Area and a 690 gross-acre UCSP Subdistricts Area. The regulatory provisions of the UCSP described above (i.e. new zoning, development standards, and design guidelines) apply only to the Subdistricts Area of the UCSP. Existing zoning and land use regulations will not be changed in the surrounding Study Area. The Subdistricts Area was a focus of the GPU's "Areas of Change," having been determined to be an area most in need of revitalization. For this reason, it is the area where redevelopment and new infill development is expected to occur and subsequently the area within which the new zoning regulations and development design guidelines of the UCSP are proposed. The UCSP Subdistricts Area encompasses the commercial corridors along Third Avenue between roughly E and L Streets, Broadway between C and L Streets, and E and H Streets between Del Mar Avenue (just east of Third Avenue) and Interstate 5. Multi-family residential areas are also included in the Subdistricts Area and are concentrated west of Broadway between D and I Streets.

Existing zoning and land use regulations will not change in the surrounding UCSP Study Area. This area was determined to consist largely of stable residential neighborhoods that would not transition within the 25-year planning horizon of the UCSP, and was thus excluded from the new zoning and land use regulatory provisions of the UCSP. However, some provisions for urban amenities and other public improvements in the UCSP will apply to the Study Area, outside of the Subdistricts Area. The potential effects of these provisions are included in Chapter 5, Environmental Impact Analysis. The 1700-acre UCSP Study Area extends generally from Interstate 5 on the west, Del Mar Avenue on the east, C Street on the north, and L Street on the South.

Pertinent content of the UCSP is summarized in Chapter 3 of this EIR. A complete copy of the Draft UCSP and appendices can be viewed at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department at 276 Fourth Avenue, the Chula Vista Civic Center Library at 365 F Street in the City of Chula Vista, and on the City of Chula Vista's website at [www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us](http://www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us).

Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15147, the appendices to this EIR are bound under separate cover and are readily available for review in their entirety at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department at 276 Fourth Avenue, the Chula Vista Civic Center Library at 365 F Street in the City of Chula Vista, and on the City of Chula Vista's website at [www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us](http://www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us).

#### Chula Vista General Plan Update

The Chula Vista General Plan Update (GPU) defines the framework by which the City's physical and economic resources are to be managed and used in the future. The GPU guides future development within the existing City limits, and also addresses areas within the City's Sphere of Influence and other portions of the GPU area beyond the City limits. The GPU is the basis for all future development; therefore, any decision by the City affecting land use and development must be consistent with the GPU. This includes proposed development projects. An action, program, or project would be considered consistent with the GPU if, considering all of its aspects, it will further the objectives and policies of the GPU and not obstruct their attainment.

During the last several years the City of Chula Vista was in the process of updating the City's 1989 General Plan. The main focus of the 1989 General Plan was on the newly annexed and developing eastern portions of the City. The recent General Plan Update (adopted December 2005) has instead focused primarily on the currently developed areas of the City, in particular the western portions of the City. As such, the planning effort was confronted with balancing "how" the City can grow over the next 25 years given the continued growth projections with "where" given the numerous established stable neighborhoods. This challenge was seen as an opportunity to use the key, foundational principles found in smart growth strategies relative to urban revitalization and apply them to areas that have experienced recent decline or underutilization.



The GPU is based on many of the common elements and concepts of smart growth such as:

- Provide a mix of compatible land uses
- Take advantage of compact building design
- Create a range of housing opportunities and choices
- Create walkable neighborhoods
- Strengthen and direct development towards existing communities
- Provide a variety of transportation choices

The GPU is organized into four large planning areas: Northwest Southwest, Bayfront, and East. Section 9 of the Land Use and Transportation Element of the GPU includes specific goals and objectives for the Northwest Planning Area. Within the Northwest Planning Area, the GPU identifies the Urban Core Subarea which comprises the central commercial area of the City. The Urban Core Subarea contains a number of smaller planning districts including the Downtown Third Avenue District, H Street Office District, Interstate 5 District, Mid Broadway District, and Mid Third Avenue District. For each of these planning districts a series of objectives is presented.

The geographic extent of the UCSP correlates to these planning districts and provides regulations, standards and design guidelines to implement the GPU policies and objectives through future private and public projects, improvements, and programs.

## **2.1.1 Urban Core Specific Plan**

The UCSP has been prepared as an implementing document for future land uses, public improvements, and programs as provided for in the GPU. In order to implement the vision for the urban core established by the GPU, it was recognized that existing zoning for the urban core needed “re-tooling.” The 30+-year-old zoning regulations are not designed to facilitate the variety of living, employment, and service choices envisioned by the GPU and quite commonplace in the twenty-first century.

The new zoning regulations would apply to the Subdistricts Area of the UCSP which encompasses three districts: the Village, the Urban Core, and the Corridors. These three districts correlate to the GPU planning districts described above in Section 2.1.1. The three UCSP districts have been refined into 26 smaller planning subdistricts each with proposed permitted land uses, land use mixes, development regulations, and standards. The new zoning regulations would replace existing Municipal Code zoning classifications for the UCSP Subdistricts Area and would introduce new zoning classifications for mixed-use (retail/office), mixed-use with residential, and urban core residential (high-density residential) as anticipated by the GPU.

In addition to establishing permitted land uses, development regulations, and standards through new zoning, the UCSP also provides development design guidelines for the Subdistricts Area which further define the type and amount of development permitted. The UCSP also establishes the City's standards for that development, including provision of services, parks and open space, and major improvements to be provided by individual projects as they are proposed.

The proposed UCSP is based on the objectives provided in the GPU and provides further detail on how these objectives will be implemented. The UCSP contains all the mandatory elements identified in Government Code Section 65451 regarding Specific Plan content and includes the following Chapters:

Chapter I: Executive Summary

Chapter II: Introduction and Background

Chapter III: Vision

Chapter IV: Existing Conditions

Chapter V: Mobility

Chapter VI: Land Use and Development Regulations

Chapter VII: Development Design Guidelines

Chapter VII: Public Realm Design Guidelines

Chapter IX: Infrastructure and Public Facilities

Chapter X: Plan Implementation and Community Benefits Program

Chapter XI: Plan Administration

For purposes of the environmental analysis, the most pertinent chapters which provide regulatory provisions or design guidance for future public and private improvements and development are Chapters V – VIII and Chapters X and XI. All chapters of the UCSP are summarized in the Project Description of this EIR (see Chapter 3). A complete copy of the Draft UCSP and appendices can be viewed at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department at 276 Fourth Avenue, the Chula Vista Civic Center Library at 365 F Street in the City of Chula Vista, and on the City of Chula Vista's website at [www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us](http://www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us).

## **2.2 CEQA Requirements**

This EIR has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of the City of Chula Vista Environmental Review Procedures and complies with all criteria, standards, and procedures of CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines.

## 2.2.1 Scope of the EIR

The scope of analysis of this EIR was determined by the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department as a result of the circulation of a Notice of Preparation (NOP) on August 18, 2005 and a scoping meeting held on September 8, 2005 at the City of Chula Vista. The City's NOP, associated responses, and comments made during the scoping meeting are included in Appendix A of this document.

Based on the responses to the NOP, comments made during the scoping meeting, and extensive review of relevant past environmental documents and of the project by City staff, it was determined that the proposed UCSP might result in potentially significant adverse environmental impacts to the following:

- Land Use, Planning, and Zoning
- Landform Alteration/Aesthetics
- Cultural Resources
- Geology and Soils
- Paleontological Resources
- Transportation, Circulation, and Access
- Housing and Population
- Water Resources and Water Quality
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Public Services and Utilities
- Hazards/Risk of Upset

These issues are discussed in detail in Section 5.0, with impacts assessed on a “plan to ground” basis. The “plan to ground” analysis addresses the changes or impacts that will result from implementation of the proposed UCSP as compared to existing ground conditions. Pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15126, all phases of the proposed UCSP are considered when evaluating its potential impact on the environment, including the phases of planning, acquisition, development, and operation.

A “plan to plan” analysis which addresses the changes or impacts that will result from implementation of the proposed UCSP as compared to the currently adopted Municipal Code Zoning is also provided in this EIR. While typically a “plan to plan” analysis would compare the proposed plan with the currently adopted plan, in this case that comparison is addressed in the land use impact analysis (Section 5.1) and rendered somewhat moot by the fact that the UCSP was written as an implementing tool for the recently adopted General Plan Update. In this case the Municipal Code Zoning (which will be superseded by the proposed UCSP for the UCSP Subdistricts Area) will form the existing plan condition under which the proposed plan will be compared. This comparison is concentrated in the discussion of the No Project alternative in Chapter 10.0 of this EIR.

Issues that were determined to be not significant are addressed in Chapter 9.0 of this EIR. These include the issues of mineral resources, biological resources, and agriculture.

Other mandatory sections required by CEQA include a discussion of cumulative impacts, growth inducement, unavoidable and irreversible significant environmental effects, and alternatives to the proposed project. These mandatory discussions are provided in Chapters 6.0, 7.0, 8.0, and 10.0, respectively, of this EIR.

The General Plan Update Final EIR (EIR #05-01, SCH #2004081066) addressed the development of the proposed UCSP area. The GPU and the GPU EIR were adopted by the Chula Vista City Council in December, 2005. The GPU EIR evaluated the entire area within the GPU boundary, including the UCSP area. Potential significant environmental effects resulting from the implementation of the GPU were identified for the issues of land use, landform alteration, biology, cultural resources, geology and soils, paleontology, agricultural resources, mineral resources, water quality, traffic, noise, air quality, public services, and hazards and risk of upset.

This EIR incorporates by reference the GPU Final EIR (EIR #05-01, SCH #2004081066) and associated Mitigation Monitoring Program as allowed in the CEQA Guidelines, Section 15150. These documents are available for review at the City of Chula Vista Planning Department at 276 Fourth Avenue, the Chula Vista Public Library Civic Center Branch at 365 F Street, and on the City of Chula Vista website documents page at [www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us](http://www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us).

This EIR contains selected information summarized from throughout these prior documents to facilitate the environmental analysis and reader's review of this document where necessary.

## **2.2.2 Purpose of the EIR**

This EIR has been prepared to achieve the following objectives:

- Inform decision makers and the general public of the potential environmental consequences of the approval and implementation of the proposed UC SP;
- Identify project alternatives or mitigation measures that are available to avoid or reduce potential significant environmental impacts;
- Serve as a basis for environmental review for all public and private development activities or undertakings pursuant to the UCSP, and resulting from approval of the UCSP;
- Provide environmental review for other lead or responsible agencies with jurisdiction over future development falling within the scope of the proposed UCSP;
- Reduce the environmental review required as subsequent development occurs according to the goals, policies, and regulations of the proposed UCSP.

In order to meet the first objective, this EIR forecasts the nature and extent of future development of the urban core pursuant to the projected buildout and various policies

and regulations that are proposed in the UCSP. Based on this foundation, the EIR identifies physical changes in the environment that may result from such future development, and in consideration of applicable threshold criteria, determines whether or not the changes constitute a significant impact. In addition, the EIR identifies mitigation measures that are available to avoid or minimize potentially significant impacts, thus meeting the second objective. The recommended mitigation measures identified in Chapter 5.0 of the EIR will be included in the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP), which will accompany the Final EIR. These measures include measures that are to be carried out as part of specific future developments.

Regarding the third and fourth objectives, environmental review of future development projects within the UCSP Sudbistracts Area will be accomplished using the Program EIR and Secondary Study process defined in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines, and Section 15182 and 15183 which allows this Program EIR to serve as the basis for subsequent projects environmental review. Section 2.3.3 discusses this process in greater detail.

### **2.2.3 Type of EIR**

This EIR has been prepared as a Program EIR, as defined in Section 15168 of the CEQA Guidelines. A Program EIR is recommended for a series of actions that are related geographically, as logical parts in a chain of contemplated actions, or in connection with the issuance of plans that govern the conduct of a continuing program [Section 15168 (a)]. The advantages of a Program EIR include the ability to provide a more exhaustive consideration of alternatives and cumulative effects than might be possible in a single project specific EIR; to avoid duplication of basic policy considerations; and to provide the Lead Agency (City of Chula Vista) with the ability to consider broad program-wide policies and mitigation measures that would apply to specific projects within the overall program [Section 15168 (b)]. In addition, as a Program EIR, this document is intended to be used by the City of Chula Vista as well as other Responsible Agencies when taking action on subsequent permits to allow development in accordance with the proposed UCSP.

### **2.2.4 Organization of the EIR**

CEQA and the CEQA Guidelines specify the contents of EIRs and require the EIR to clearly identify the location of the specified contents. CEQA and the Guidelines do not, however, specify the format within which those items shall be included. In this EIR, a topical organization has been followed so that most of the information related to a single issue or topic is presented within the same report section. Table 2-1 lists the CEQA Guidelines references for required content and the location of each in this EIR. In addition, a brief overview of the chapters of this EIR are provided below:

**TABLE 2-1  
CEQA-REQUIRED EIR CONTENTS**

CEQA Guidelines Section	Topic	Location in this EIR
15122	Table of Contents or Index	Table of Contents and this table
15123	Summary	Chapter 1.0
15124	Project Description	Chapter 3.0, with further details in each topical discussion in Chapter 5.0 as appropriate
15125	Environmental Setting	Summarized in Chapter 4.0 with more detail in the "Existing Conditions" section for each topic in Chapter 5.0
15126	Environmental Impact	
	(a) Significant Effects	"Impacts" sections of Chapter 5.0
	(b) Significant Effects Which Cannot Be Avoided	"Impacts" sections of Chapter 5.0
	(c) Mitigation Measures	"Mitigation" sections of Chapter 5.0
	(d) Alternatives	Chapter 10.0
	(e) Significant Irreversible Changes	Chapter 8.0
	(f) Growth Inducing Impacts	Chapter 7.0
15128	Effects Found Not To Be Significant	Chapter 9.0
15129	Organizations and Persons Consulted	Chapter 12.0
15130	Cumulative Impacts	Chapter 6.0
15148	Citations of Sources	Chapter 11.0

- **Chapter 1.0 Executive Summary** provides a summary of the proposed UCSP along with a table identifying significant impacts, proposed mitigation measures, and impact rating after mitigation. This chapter also contains a summary of the project alternatives that have been considered and compares the potential impacts of the alternatives with those of the proposed UCSP.
- **Chapter 2.0 Introduction** contains an overview of the proposed UCSP and the CEQA environmental review process.
- **Chapter 3.0 Project Description** provides a detailed discussion of the proposed UCSP, including background, objectives, anticipated buildout, mobility recommendations, land use and development regulations, development design guidelines, public realm guidelines, plan implementation, permit design review process, and plan administration. It also includes a list of discretionary actions that will be required to implement the proposed UCSP.
- **Chapter 4.0 Environmental Setting** contains a description of the physical environmental conditions (climate, topography, context) in the project area and vicinity.
- **Chapter 5.0 Environmental Impact Analysis** provides a detailed evaluation of specific issues that may be associated with significant environmental impacts. The discussion of each issue begins with a discussion of the existing conditions related to the issue to serve as a basis of analysis. An evaluation of potential impacts follows. The discussion of impacts is preceded by a statement of specific thresholds that are used to determine if the impacts would be significant. Once the impacts have been evaluated, specific mitigation measures are identified to avoid or reduce significant impacts.
- **Chapter 6.0 Cumulative Impacts** identifies the impact of the proposed UCSP in combination with other planned and future development in the region.
- **Chapter 7.0 Growth Inducing Impacts** evaluates the potential influence the proposed UCSP may have on growth within the project area as well as the region.
- **Chapter 8.0 Significant Irreversible Changes** identifies all of the significant impacts related to the proposed UCSP that cannot be avoided.
- **Chapter 9.0 Effects Found Not to Be Significant** lists all of the issues determined in the scoping process to be not significant, including a brief summary of the basis for this determination.

- **Chapter 10.0 Alternatives** provides a description of alternatives to the proposed UCSP.
- **Chapter 11.0 References** lists all of the documents, individuals, and organizations which are cited in the EIR.
- **Chapter 12.0 EIR Preparation** identifies all of the agencies, organizations and individuals who were directly involved in or were consulted for the preparation of the EIR.

Technical studies and supporting materials are provided in the appendixes, which are bound under separate cover and are available for review at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department, 276 Fourth Avenue, Chula Vista, the Chula Vista Public Library Civic Center Branch at 365 F Street, Chula Vista, and on the City of Chula Vista's website at [www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us](http://www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us).

## 2.3 EIR Review Process

The City of Chula Vista is the Lead Agency for the preparation and review of this EIR. The EIR review process occurs in two basic stages. The first stage is the Draft EIR, which offers the public the opportunity to comment on the document, while the second stage is the Final EIR, which provides the basis for approving the proposed project.

### 2.3.1 Draft EIR

This Draft EIR will be distributed for review to the public and public agencies for a 45-day review period for the purpose of providing comments “on the sufficiency of the document in identifying and analyzing the possible impacts on the environment and ways in which the significant effects of the project might be avoided and mitigated” (Section 15204, CEQA Guidelines). In accordance with Section 15087 (a) (1) of the CEQA Guidelines, a Notice of Availability of the Draft EIR will be issued in a newspaper of general circulation in the area. Copies of the Draft EIR will be distributed to responsible agencies and other interested parties and will be available for review at the City of Chula Vista Community Development Department, 276 Fourth Avenue, Chula Vista, the Chula Vista Public Library Civic Center Branch at 365 F Street, and on the City of Chula Vista's website at [www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us](http://www.ci.chula-vista.ca.us).

A public hearing will be held at the end of the 45-day State Clearinghouse public review period by the Planning Commission to gather verbal comments on the adequacy of the document.



### **2.3.2 Final EIR**

The City, as Lead Agency, will provide written responses to comments received on the Draft EIR per CEQA Guidelines Section 15088, and will consider all comments in making its decision to certify the Final EIR. Detailed responses to the comments received during public review; a Mitigation, Monitoring and Reporting Plan (MMRP); Findings of Fact; and, if necessary, a Statement of Overriding Considerations will be prepared as part of the EIR finalization process. The culmination of this process is a public hearing where the City Council will determine whether to certify the Final EIR as being complete and in accordance with CEQA.

### **2.3.3 Subsequent Environmental Review**

Future development within the UCSP area, proposed pursuant to the UCSP, will be viewed in light of the Final EIR pursuant to CEQA Guidelines Section 15168, 15182 and 15183. Unless exempt from CEQA review as allowed in Section 15061 of the CEQA Guidelines, as each new development is proposed, a Secondary Study will be prepared to determine if the Final EIR adequately addresses the potential environmental impacts of the proposed development. No additional environmental documentation will be required for subsequent projects if the Secondary Study determines that the potential environmental effects have been adequately addressed in the Final EIR and/or individual developments would implement appropriate mitigation measures identified in the MMRP accompanying the Final EIR. In such cases, the Final EIR would be referenced in approving the required discretionary actions.

If the Secondary Study identifies new impacts or a substantial change in circumstances, additional environmental documentation would be required. The form of this documentation would depend upon the nature of the impacts of the development proposal being considered. Should a development result in new or substantially more severe significant impacts that are not adequately covered in this EIR, or there is a substantial change in circumstances that would require major revision to this EIR, or new information comes to light which was not known at the time this EIR was certified, a Subsequent EIR or Supplement to this EIR would be prepared in accordance with Sections 15162 and 15163 of the CEQA Guidelines. If potential new significant impacts can be fully mitigated, a Mitigated Negative Declaration would be prepared. If some changes or additions to this EIR are necessary, but none of the conditions described above calling for the preparation of a Subsequent or Supplemental EIR have occurred, the Lead Agency or Responsible Agency would prepare an Addendum. Unlike a Supplemental or Subsequent EIR, an Addendum to a previously certified EIR need not be circulated for public review and can be included in or attached to the Final EIR in accordance with Section 15164 of the CEQA Guidelines. More detailed development-specific studies conducted as part of this subsequent environmental review would further

quantify environmental impacts and generate project-specific mitigation measures to avoid or minimize significant environmental impacts of specific developments.